









THE  
WESTMINSTER  
REVIEW.

JULY AND OCTOBER,  
1885.

"Truth can never be confirm'd enough,  
Though doubts did ever sleep."

SHAKSPERE.

Wahrheitsliebe zeigt sich darin, daß man überall das Gute zu finden und zu schätzen weiß.  
GÖTTE.

NEW SERIES.

VOL. LXVIII.

LONDON:  
TRÜBNER & CO., LUDGATE HILL.  
MDCCCLXXXV.



THE  
WESTMINSTER  
AND  
FOREIGN QUARTERLY  
REVIEW.

JULY, 1885.

ART. I.—OUR LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANIES.

1. *The Life Assurance Companies Act*, 1870.
2. *Life Assurance Blue Books*, 1874, &c.
3. *Insurance Guide and Handbook*. By CORNELIUS WALFORD, F.S.A., F.S.S. London: W. S. D. Pateman. 1857.
4. *Insurance Encyclopædia*. By CORNELIUS WALFORD, F.S.A., F.S.S. London: C. & E. Layton. 1880-4.
5. *Insurance Register*. By WILLIAM WHITE, F.S.S. London: C. & E. Layton. 1885.

SINCE the passing of the Life Assurance Act, 1870, we have had the fullest and best information possible of these companies. On other occasions we have drawn special attention to their operations, believing as we do in the importance of the subject, and the immense advantage of life assurance.

But the great progress made by our life assurance companies during the last twenty and thirty years, and the enormous proportions to which some of them have attained, demands from us a further notice.

We have no intention of criticizing the operations or position of any particular society; we shall leave the public to do that for themselves, which any one may now easily find out. The insurance blue-books may be consulted at our free libraries,

[Vol. CXXIV. No. CCXLVII.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LXVIII. No. I. A

and Mr. White's Insurance Register can be had for one shilling. These contain, and especially the latter, all the information that is required and necessary in making the choice of an office in which to assure.

We are indebted to the Insurance Register especially, which we beg to acknowledge, and we can rely on its statistics. This is the seventeenth year of its publication; it was very good when first published in 1868, but now the little book is invaluable. No officer, or even clerk, in an insurance office, should be without a copy; to an insurance agent it is indispensable; and any person about to insure his life should read it. The progress and position of every company can easily be found out by the book, as it contains the yearly progress and present financial position of all, and a summary of the total amount of assurances effected and in existence during the last four years.

We have now 105 life assurance offices, twenty-five of which are also fire companies, but they have to make their returns to the Board of Trade, in accordance with the Life Assurance Act, the same as life offices. The Act requiring the deposit of £20,000, to be invested in Government securities, on the establishment of a life assurance company, has completely stopped their formation.

Previous to 1870 it was not unusual for eight or ten companies to be established every year. From 1844 to 1856, a period of only twelve years, 425 insurance companies were promoted and provisionally registered, 220 were completely registered, and sixty-nine were in existence in 1857. But since the passing of the Act—a period of fourteen years—only seven companies have been founded. Two of these were registered to take over the business of existing companies; another was not successful, and the business was transferred to another society; three of the remaining four are Scotch offices, and the last is a life and accident company, established in Birmingham. So that we have this remarkable fact, that no life assurance company has been founded in London for fourteen years—that is, not since the passing of the Life Assurance Act in 1870.

Since that period, however, several companies have given up business. They have either amalgamated with other companies, or are now winding up in the Court of Chancery. Of the companies now in existence and doing business, sixty-two were established previous to 1840, and forty-three since; four from 1762 to 1800, eleven from 1800 to 1820, forty-seven from 1820 to 1840, twenty-six from 1840 to 1860, thirteen from 1860 to 1870, and four from 1870 to 1884.

Notwithstanding that only four new insurance companies

have been established during the last fourteen years, there has been a steady and remarkable increase in the business done, as set forth in the following summary :—

Years.	No. of Companies Reporting.	Total Income.	Total Expenditure.	Excess of Income over Expenditure.
		£	£	£
1871	110	14,456,261	11,815,363	2,640,898
1872	118	15,001,631	11,791,580	3,210,051
1873	120	15,535,581	12,125,292	3,410,289
1874	120	15,819,053	12,410,036	3,409,017
1875	114	16,604,649	12,888,188	3,716,461
1876	108	16,978,115	13,600,491	3,377,624
1877	109	17,610,655	13,766,862	3,853,793
1878	107	18,048,355	14,184,486	3,863,869
1879	108	18,961,018	14,830,359	4,130,659
1880	107	19,354,054	16,064,460	3,289,594
1881	106	19,991,940	15,995,160	3,996,780
1882	107	20,623,509	15,976,086	4,647,423
1883	104	21,354,173	16,575,443	4,778,730
1884	105	22,051,708	17,680,786	4,370,922

This shows an increase in the annual income, in 14 years, of £7,595,447, a little over half-a-million a year.

It must represent a large influx of new members every year. All the offices do not report the amount of new business and new policies issued yearly. Mr. White, in the Insurance Register, gives the business as reported from 60 companies :—Number of policies issued, 60,689 ; sum assured, £26,290,591 ; new premiums, £906,718. This would represent about three-fourths of the new business done, allowing that the offices not reporting are doing the least amount of business. If, then, we add one-fourth more to the above figures, the number of policies issued last year will be 75,736, and the sum assured £32,862,988.

Now, how many policies have we to deduct from these to show the actual increase? Can we tell how many have died, and how many have surrendered their policies? We can tell the sums paid in claims at death—viz., £11,720,335, and taking the average at £400 each, it represents 29,300 persons. The sum paid on policies surrendered was £746,045, and if we allow £100 to each, 7,460 would be cancelled ; making together 36,760 policies to be taken off 75,736, showing a net increase of 38,976.

The total sum assured by all the offices is estimated at £450,000,000, and the total amount of premiums received for the year 1884 was £15,369,667. The total sum assured can only

be estimated from the premiums received at £3 per cent., the rate of the average age of lives assured.

We should like now to know the number of persons at this time assured. We admit that it is difficult to find this out, and at the best it can only be estimated. This is done by taking the average of the sum assured by each person. One writer says the average is £300; another says it is £400. If we take the medium of these, and say £350, we may be nearer the mark, and the number of persons assured is 1,285,714. This appears a very small number indeed out of a population of 35,000,000—less than 4 per cent. But is it right or fair to reckon the number insured out of the gross population, as some have done? We think not, for it should be taken out of those who are insurable and usually insure their lives.

To arrive at this, we must first deduct from the gross population all under 20 years of age, about one-half—17,500,000. Secondly, we must deduct women, for admitting that some women assure, yet they are so few as not to affect the calculation; we must then deduct another half, if no more, for it is well known that there are more women living than men: this brings the number down to 8,750,000. There is still another deduction to be made for the working classes, for they nearly all assure for small sums in the industrial assurance companies or friendly societies. One of these industrial companies has 6,000,000 members, but these include men, women, and children of all ages. The working classes do not insure their lives in the general insurance offices, and they compose more than one-half of the male population above 20 years of age; deducting one-half only for these, it brings down the number of likely and eligible persons to assure to 4,375,000. •

It is out of this number that 1,285,714 are assured, which is nearly 30 per cent., a much more satisfactory fact than the statements we sometimes hear, of only 5 or 10 per cent. being assured; but considering the great advantages of life assurance, we are not a little surprised to find that double the number are not assured. It is a strange fact that very few voluntarily insure their lives. One of the best and most successful agents told us a short time ago that out of about 1,000 persons whom he had insured during his life, only five had called at his office and offered themselves for assurance. No doubt there will be a much larger proportion than this who call at the head offices of the companies to assure; but, except for business purposes, nearly all the assurances are effected by the agents. We believe there are three or four offices that do not employ agents, but there are only three or four such companies out of 105, and their business is not large. Many companies have a thousand agents, and

some even more. The benefits of life assurance are so great, that it is worth spreading as much as possible. The number assured does not represent the number to be benefited. Taking the estimate of five in a family, after allowing for the death of the head of the family, it is not the 1,285,741 assured that are to reap the advantage, but the 5,000,000 widows and orphans amongst whom the large sum of £450,000,000 is eventually to be distributed.

The financial position of the companies is very strong. All the offices, except fourteen, showed last year a large increase in their reserve funds. Referring to the statement given on p. 3, the excess of income over the expenditure for the last fourteen years amounted to the large sum of £52,696,110, an average of £3,764,000 a year. The sum withdrawn from the reserve funds by the fourteen companies whose disbursements last year were more than their receipts was under half-a-million, but the total increase last year was £4,671,249, after allowing for this deficiency in a few companies. Three of the companies have for some time discontinued accepting new business, and the reason of the falling-off in the other companies appears to be the small amount of new business done, but as far as we can judge, their reserve funds appear ample to pay all their claims as they may arise, for they continue to make and distribute large profits.

The total life assurance fund of all the companies amounts to £135,029,616, to meet a prospective liability of £450,000,000 assured. The question is often asked, how much ought a life assurance company to have on hand, or in reserve and invested, to meet its claims and to be absolutely safe? Five years' premium, says one writer; but we cannot see how this rule can apply to all the companies. It must depend on the age of the company and the amount of new business that has been done every year. It is quite certain that a company fifty years old should have three or four times as much funds on hand as a company twenty years old; and a company fifty years old may have double the income from premiums that it had twenty years ago. How unfair then it would be to say that such a company should have five or more years' premium at their present rate.

The reserve of £135,000,000 is just equal to an average of *nine* years' premium for all the companies; but some have twenty years' premium, while others have only two or three years'. For example:—



	Established.	Annual Premium.	Reserve.	Years' Premium.
A. B. ...	1825 ...	£49,636 ...	£1,015,677	= 20½
C. D. ...	1808 ...	79,735 ...	1,497,747	= 19
E. F. ...	1823 ...	229,791 ...	4,255,817	= 18½
G. H. ...	1806 ...	127,053 ...	1,847,812	= 14½
I. J. ...	1837 ...	125,621 ...	749,681	= 6½
K. L. ...	1862 ...	102,833 ...	312,787	= 3

Another method of testing the stability of a company is to consider the amount of reserve in proportion to the sum assured, and it has been said that a company should have not less than 25 per cent.; but this plan, like the previous one, cannot be a fair, safe, or true guide, for it must depend entirely upon the age of the company. The reserve of all the companies together is 30 per cent.; sum assured, £450,000,000; reserve, £135,000,000. This is the life assurance fund, and does not include £11,321,546 share capital.

Taking a few examples to illustrate this theory, it will be seen at once how much the companies differ, and that the age of the company must be taken into consideration.

	Established.	Sum Assured.	Reserve.	Per Cent.
A. ...	1829 ...	£7,467,500 ...	£3,148,166	= 42
B. ...	1806 ..	4,733,710 ..	1,847,812	= 39
C. ...	1834 ...	2,865,768 ...	981,586	= 34
D. ...	1825 ...	20,521,954 ...	5,918,399	= 28
E. ...	1843 .	8,490,123 ...	2,155,313	= 25
F. ...	1847 ...	4,434,661 ...	955,623	= 21½
G. ...	1864 ...	1,475,597 ..	207,346	= 14
H. ...	1865 ..	1,529,821 ..	231,182	= 15

The second company in this list has in addition a paid-up capital of over a million, which, if added to the reserve life fund, would give 60 per cent. on hand of the sum assured. •

These examples are sufficient for our purpose, and prove beyond doubt the absolute safety of our life assurance companies. One hundred are more than fourteen years old, and about fifty have been established from forty to sixty years. We do not say but that there is a great difference between some of the companies, and mainly in the amount of profits distributed amongst the assured. The practice is now universal for the members to share in the profits if they pay for it, because all the companies have two scales of premium, "with profits" and "without profits," the difference being from 15 to 20 per cent.:—Age twenty; premium with profits, £1 16s. 11d.; without profits, £1 11s. 8d. Age thirty; with profits, £2 9s. 2d.; without, £2 2s. 2d. Age forty; with profits, £3 6s. 6d.; without, £2 16s. 2d. Age fifty; with profits, £4 14s. 0d.; without, £3 18s. 1d.

The profits and bonuses paid by most of the companies far exceed this difference. We must deal with the cash bonus to compare and understand this. Taking the prospectus of an insurance company established over fifty years, it gives this example of bonus:—A. B., age thirty, insured his life for £1,000, premium £24 11s. 8d. per annum. In ten years he was paid £74 2s. 8d. cash bonus out of £245 16s. 8d. premium paid in. This is 30 per cent. The extra premium he had paid in on the “with profit” scale was £35, but he received back £74, making a profit of £39. This example is carried on for thirty years. In that time he would have paid in premiums £737 10s. 0d., and the cash bonus returned is £258 3s. 5d.—35 per cent. The extra premium paid on the “with profit” scale was £105, but as he had £258 returned, he made a profit of £153 by the extra premium on the “with profit” scale. We may then conclude that every person had better insure under the “with profit” table.

As is well known, most companies give to the assured the option of three plans on which to receive the bonus—first, in cash; secondly, in reversion, by adding it to the sum assured, payable at death; thirdly, by reduction of the premium.

The large bonuses paid are more apparent when deferred—that is, added to the policy and payable only at death. In the previous case mentioned, the reversionary bonus was £480 1s. 10d. on £737 10s. 0d. premium paid; no less than 65 per cent. This bonus was added to the policy in about equal proportions every five years, so that if the assured had died in five years, £1,080 would have been paid; in ten years, £1,160; or in twenty years, £1,320. It is not for us to explain how this can possibly be done; we only mention the facts. A man dies in twenty years, fourteen years before his time, or the average period and expectancy of his life. He has only paid £491 13s. 4d. in premium on £1,000, instead of £835 16s. 8d., and yet there is paid on his death £1,320. We are bound to say that we know of nothing that can compare with life assurance as a simple investment, if taken apart from the main advantage of life assurance, that the full sum assured of £1,000, or any amount, is payable in the event of death if it should happen the day when the premium is paid.

It is quite certain to our minds that the reversionary bonus is the best and the most profitable for the assurer to take, for not only does he secure about twice as much as the cash bonus, but after twenty years he may be in bad health, and yet he is permitted by the bonus to effect an additional assurance on his life every five years, without medical examination, or any inquiry as to his state of health. The cash bonus is first ascertained by

the office—say it is £50; then what sum will £50 paid down assure for at age thirty? Answer, £110, which would be the amount of the reversionary bonus. An eminent author on life assurance has written very strongly on this subject, and maintains that when an assurer chooses to have the reversionary bonus he should undergo a strict medical examination. His objections are still stronger to the tontine system, by which plan the reversionary bonuses are much larger than those we have quoted, no bonuses being paid until a certain age, and very few men would be in the same state of health thirty years after insuring as they were when they passed the doctor.

The tontine system for the payment of the bonuses is without doubt the most equitable, for by this plan no bonus is payable unless the assured live, say, thirty years, or until he attains the expectancy of life. The premiums charged are much less than the ordinary rates with bonus, but about the same as without bonus. The lowest rate of any office for “deferred profits” is, at age thirty, £2 1s. 6d. Under this system, if the assured die before attaining his expectancy, the full sum assured would only be paid; but for every year he should live after, bonuses will be added to his policy and payable at death.

We find that several companies give their bonuses in the reduction of the premiums only. It is said that it is done to avoid the adding a large reversionary bonus to the policy after the assured may be in a bad state of health. The reductions of the future premium for life is stated to be 4s. 1d., at age 30, for every £10 of reversionary bonus, if it be surrendered to the office.

There is yet another plan of allotting the bonuses which has been recently adopted by some companies: “payment of the policy during lifetime,” that is the very attractive way it is announced. “The profits may be applied to the conversion of the policy to one terminable at a given age, *without extra premium*, so that he may receive the amount of his policy DURING HIS OWN LIFETIME. Thus on the first division of profits his policy may be declared determinable on his attaining the age of seventy years; on the next division, the term would be probably shortened to sixty-seven years; and all future profits being similarly applied, would further shorten the period.” We quote from the prospectus of a company.

We have not heard of the scheme being fully realized by any one; perhaps it has not been adopted long enough; but if it be possible to carry it out, if the profits can really be appropriated “to shorten the time of the policy,” and make it payable to the assured himself at a given age, it is undoubtedly the best and most attractive plan. The extra premium per cent., age thirty, for an endowment policy, the sum assured payable at

fifty-five or at death, is £1 4s. On the assumption, as given in the prospectus quoted, that at the first division of profits the term of the policy would be fixed and made payable at seventy, and reduced three years every five years, at each division, then, in twenty-five years there would have been five divisions, reducing the policy fifteen years, and making it payable at fifty-five, the very age the assured would have attained, he having entered at thirty years of age.

We say again, if this is feasible and possible, it is the best scheme we have ever heard of. It appears to us but another plan of the tontine bonus: it is payable only to those who live a certain age; if death occurs say in twenty or twenty-four years, no bonus whatever is paid. The ordinary with bonus scale of premium—£2 9s. 2d., but not £3 13s. 1d., the endowment premium—at age thirty, is payable. It may be that the cash or surrender value of the policy and bonus, after twenty-five or thirty years, is equal to the original sum assured; if so, the whole system is fully explained and answered, and it can be accomplished.

The following example of deferred bonus, which we take from the prospectus of a large Scotch office, nearly meets the case in point:—

Age thirty, sum assured £1,000, annual premium £25, with profits; payable after thirty-four years, on attaining the age of sixty-four. Result: total premium paid, £875; bonus additions to policy, £1,440; cash value of policy and bonus, £1,281. It is explained that on this plan of deferred bonus the bonus additions at each division of profits were at the rate of £4 per £100 per annum, being three or four times more than the ordinary bonus. If the assured should die in thirty-three years, there would be paid the sum assured only, £1,000, and he would lose £1,440 bonus, having died one year before the time fixed upon.

• The question now is—The cash value of the policy of £1,000, and bonus £1,440, being £1,281 in thirty-four years, what is its cash value in twenty-five years? or in what number of years will it amount to £1,000? If worth £1,281 in thirty-four years, when is it worth £1,000? Answer: in twenty-seven years. This, then, would be making the policy payable during *LIFETIME*. The scheme is the payment of the ordinary premium “with profits” scale, and no profits payable for twenty-seven years, and then the full sum assured, £1,000, is paid on attaining the age of fifty-seven: an endowment assurance made payable at a certain age by appropriation of the profits and without extra premium.

The profits made by most of the offices are very large. We

now give a list of the profits made by twenty-five during their last period of valuation. This statement shows the total amount of premium received during the last three, five, seven, or ten years, as the case may be, the amount of profits, and the percentage of the profits on the premium.

Established.	Years' Valuation.	Amount of Premiums received.	Amount of Profits ascertained.	Percentage on Premiums.
		£	£	
1762	10	1,488,230	1,893,705	127
1806	1	237,902	218,656	91
1808	5	449,857	259,006	57½
1806	7	1,044,759	610,528	58½
1720	5	664,853	305,828	46
1836	3	442,775	202,861	45½
1820	5	1,006,157	453,050	45
1835	3	461,530	201,531	43½
1823	5	1,137,600	459,343	40½
1835	5	1,609,696	614,676	38
1810	5	644,579	233,749	36½
1815	7	4,024,940	1,347,756	33½
1840	5	531,421	146,947	27½
1806	5	961,300	260,750	27
1843	5	1,133,858	299,156	26½
1824	5	528,039	140,560	26½
1826	5	1,111,092	278,884	25
1833	7	372,652	94,626	25
1837	7	2,258,197	624,474	23½
1838	5	726,458	144,343	20
1825	5	2,880,321	503,316	17½
1807	5	1,308,463	218,182	16½
1836	5	232,151	31,129	13½
1836	5	1,023,041	130,380	12½
1848	3	1,421,864	94,496	6½

The profits made are evidences of low expenditure, low mortality, good management, and ample funds well and profitably invested. We are surprised that there should be such a difference in the companies, all established with the same objects, yet with results varying from 6 to 91 per cent. on profits made on premiums, not including the exceptional case first on the list.

What is the source of these large profits? Many, which on consideration will fully explain the matter.

First, the large and unmistakable diminution in the mortality of all classes during the last hundred and especially the last forty and fifty years, is a great source of profit. No alterations have been made in the tables of the insurance companies, which are based principally on the Carlisle Table of Mortality compiled from the bills of mortality from 1779 to 1787. The people's lives have been prolonged on account of the improved

sanitary regulations of our towns. Now we have large municipal corporations, or local boards, in nearly every city, town, or village, whose special duty it is to look after the health of the inhabitants. And besides this, the important progress made in medical science, and the treatment of all diseases, especially infectious diseases, such as small-pox, fever, &c., must have reduced the mortality to a large extent.

A very casual reading of the various reports of the companies will show in most cases a special reference to the fact that claims during the past year have not reached the expectancy. One of the largest companies, if not the largest, we have, says: "The number of deaths amongst the society's members in 1884 was 434, which was nearly 26 per cent. less than the number expected by the tables on which the society's calculations are based." This improvement is still going on, and must be a source of great profit to all the offices.

Secondly, the extra interest obtained on investments, over and above the rates calculated and allowed in the premiums, must also be a large source of profit. We understand the tables to be made out to yield 3 and at most  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. Now the average rate of interest obtained by insurance companies is  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent., as it ranges from 4 to 4.80; in fact, there is only one office in which the interest is as low as 4, and there is one company which has £2,865,000 invested at 5.12 per cent. So, then, we shall be right in estimating an extra profit of 1 per cent. on the investments. The life assurance and annuity funds amount to £137,345,900, which therefore yields a profit of one million three hundred and seventy-three thousand pounds above the calculation.

Thirdly, the saving of expenses which is allowed in the tables is another great source of profit. It is no doubt well known that there is a charge, which is called a "loading," on all the premiums; the rate is generally 20 per cent. The expenses of the various companies range from 4 to 65 per cent. on the premiums. There is only one office at so high a rate, and one at each of the following rates—61, 50, 40, 37, 27, 26, 25 per cent.; fifteen are from 20 to 25; but there are fifty companies whose expenses range from 10 to 17 per cent., and nine are below 10. The average rate of all the offices is  $13\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. As 20 per cent. is allowed, this effects a saving of  $6\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. on the premium income of £15,369,667, which amounts to £998,928. If we add this sum to the excess of interest, £1,373,549, we have a profit of £2,372,477 from these two sources.

Fourthly, the non-participating and term policies must also be a source of profit. This must be considerable, else the companies would not do the business. We cannot tell the propor-

tion of the policies that are issued without profits by all the offices, because it differs in every one. We find that a large company has £6,000,000 assured with profits and £3,000,000 without profits; while another insures £7,000,000 with profits and only £1,000,000 without. With many other offices it is only about one-tenth that are assured without profits, but this represents a large amount, about £45,000,000, yielding an annual premium of £1,500,000. Mr. Walford says that, "as a rule, the rates for this kind of business are generally calculated to yield a handsome profit."

The selection of lives by an assurance office—every candidate having to undergo a strict medical examination before he is accepted—must be very much in favour of the companies, although we are now told that this selection does not hold good and is of no advantage after five years. Admitting this, yet there must be a great saving, if only for five years. The mortality tables, from which the insurance tables are framed, embrace all, irrespective of their present health or occupation. Even without a medical examination, the company can refuse to accept any man on account of his trade and occupation. We are informed that no company will now insure publicans or beer-shop keepers, although some may at exorbitant rates, or for an endowment assurance at about 40 per cent. extra premium. At the ages 45–55 the mortality amongst the whole population is at the rate of 18 per 1,000, but out of a thousand farmers only 12 will die, shoemakers 15, grocers 16, blacksmiths 17, miners 20, bakers 21, butchers 23, publicans and beer-shop keepers 28. A company may reject any of the dangerous classes, and thereby still further reduce their mortality.

Formerly a large amount of profit was made out of lapsed policies, but we are glad to find that this is not the case now. All the offices will give a good and fair surrender value for the policy. Some offices require a certain number of premiums to be paid, three or five years, before they will purchase the policy, but others will purchase it at any time. Another plan is also adopted to give a paid-up policy, free from all future premiums, which in many cases is equal to all the premiums paid in.

We give on page 13 a few examples of the bonuses paid by several companies. We take the age of 30 only, and give the cash and reversionary bonus paid or allotted every five years for thirty years on an assurance for £100.

These are ten very good offices, and seven of the very best; there are no offices which pay higher bonuses than these; they are all well known, and have very large accumulated reserve funds. The only difference in favour of one company over

# Our Life Assurance Companies.

13

Company Established.	5 years.		10 years.		15 years.		20 years.		25 years.		30 years.		Total.	
	Cash Bonus.	Reversionary Bonus.	Cash Bonus.	Reversionary Bonus.	Cash Bonus.	Reversionary Bonus.	Cash Bonus.	Reversionary Bonus.	Cash Bonus.	Reversionary Bonus.	Cash Bonus.	Reversionary Bonus.	Cash Bonus.	Reversionary Bonus.
1823	£ s. d. 4 4 0	£ s. d. 11 0 0	£ s. d. 4 4 0	£ s. d. 10 0 0	£ s. d. 4 4 0	£ s. d. 9 0 0	£ s. d. 4 3 0	£ s. d. 8 0 0	£ s. d. 4 12 0	£ s. d. 8 0 0	£ s. d. 5 1 0	£ s. d. 8 10 0	£ s. d. 26 8 0	£ s. d. 54 10 0
1806	...	2 12 0	3 5 0	5 17 0	2 18 0	8 15 0	3 12 0	12 7 0	2 18 0	15 5 0	3 12 0	18 17 0	16 5 0	63 13 0
1810	3 12 7	8 7 3	3 14 8	8 0 5	4 7 10	8 12 9	4 7 9	7 13 5	4 7 11	7 4 3	5 4 4	7 10 6	25 15 1	47 13 7
1834	...	8 0 0	...	7 0 0	...	8 0 0	...	7 0 0	...	7 0 0	...	7 0 0	...	44 0 0
1835	...	5 14 0	...	6 2 0	...	6 13 0	...	7 8 0	...	8 8 0	...	9 12 0	...	43 17 0
1806	...	2 15 0	...	5 3 0	...	7 4 0	...	9 0 0	...	9 9 0	...	10 5 0	...	43 16 0
1831	...	6 5 0	...	6 12 1	...	6 19 8	...	7 5 7	...	7 14 0	...	8 10 5	...	43 5 9
1807	2 17 0	8 7 0	2 17 0	7 9 0	2 17 0	6 12 0	2 17 0	5 18 0	2 17 0	4 12 0	2 17 0	4 5 0	17 2 0	37 9 0
1862	1 14 1	6 5 0	1 18 10	6 5 0	2 4 8	6 5 0	2 11 3	6 5 0	2 15 0	6 5 0	3 0 0	6 5 0	14 2 0	37 10 0
1837	2 9 8	5 5 0	2 9 8	4 16 0	2 16 6	5 0 0	2 16 6	4 11 0	2 18 0	5 0 0	3 0 0	5 2 0	16 8 0	30 14 0



another is the bonus paid : the difference is not, as some suppose, whether the society is mutual or not. That does not appear to make any difference in the bonus. Four in the list given are mutual. Although a mutual society has no dividend or profits to pay the shareholders, yet they are bound to keep back a larger proportion of the profits for the reserve, as they have no guarantee from the shareholders.

We cannot tell the full value of these bonuses unless we reckon the premiums paid in thirty years, which is not given in the examples by the companies. The premium paid on the first in the list is £74. The cash bonus is therefore 35 per cent., and the reversionary bonus is 73 per cent. The premium paid on the second case given is £80, cash bonus 20 per cent., reversionary bonus  $78\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. The premium paid on the third example is £73 15s., cash bonus 35 per cent., reversionary bonus  $64\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. The last example, premium paid £74 3s., cash bonus  $21\frac{2}{3}$  per cent., reversionary bonus  $40\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. Every one must be struck with the great difference in the profits paid, from 21 to 35 per cent. cash bonus, and from 40 per cent. to  $78\frac{1}{2}$  reversionary bonus. The method adopted in the payment of the cash bonus and the allotment of the reversionary bonus is different in all the companies ; one company gives the largest bonus in the first five years out of thirty—£11 against £8 10s. in the last five years ; another company gives the smallest in the first five years, £2 12s., and the largest in the last five years, £18 17s. ; whilst another company pays the same bonus at every division and period of five years—viz., £6 5s. The different methods adopted by the offices are—1st, To pay the bonus on the premiums paid in ; 2nd, To pay the bonus on the sum assured ; 3rd, To pay on the sum assured and the bonus additions ; 4th, To pay on the sum assured from the date of the policy.

These bonuses, it must be admitted, are very large : no special or particular offices have been chosen for the examples given ; they are fair, good, and ordinary specimens. The effect of these bonuses is to reduce the actual cost of life assurance to a very small sum. Take a case, the third on the list given. The cash bonus is £3 12s. 7d.—out of what ? The premium with profits of that company is £2 9s. 2d. per cent., and in the first five years £12 5s. 10d. would have been paid, which is reduced by the bonus to £1 14s. 8d. per cent. per annum. The premium without profits at age thirty is £2 2s. 2d. per cent.—7s. per cent. less ; but by the profits he saves 14s. 6d. per cent. ; better, therefore, pay the extra premium required, and assure with profits. The reversionary bonus gives a stronger and still better proof of the small actual cost of life assurance. Take the same

example, age thirty, and the same premium as paid, £12 5s. 10d.; the reversionary bonus in five years is £8 7s. 3d., reducing the premium to 15s. 9d. per cent. per annum, a return of £1 13s. 5d. a year out of £2 9s. 2d.

Who would not be ready at once to insure his life on such terms as these? We especially desire to make this matter of the bonuses very plain. Here are the facts: these profits are honestly and fairly made; they are not made by the sacrifice of any principles, or to the loss of any class of assurers; all may share alike in the profits if they choose.

The examples which we have given are the ordinary and regular bonuses paid by the majority of the companies. The prospectuses of several companies give other examples of special cases, on old lives, much higher. The bonuses added to a policy of £5,000 were £9,169; total sum payable, £14,169. The bonuses on another policy for £1,000 were £1,570; total sum payable, £2,570. Another, date of policy, 1827; sum assured, £1,000; bonus additions, £2,071 10s.; total sum payable at death, £3,071 10s.

The question must soon arise, whether this bonus system should still continue after so long an experience? Would it not be much better to take lower premiums and pay smaller bonuses? Why take money that is not required and give it back again? There appears to be no fear whatever of the slightest variation occurring in the mortality of the people, except for the better, which will be to the advantage of the companies. Let the premiums be reduced all round.

This has been done already by two companies—by one established sixty years, at from 9 to 26 per cent. according to the age. At age thirty the premium is only £2 4s. 3d. per cent. per annum, with profits, against £2 10s., the usual premium charged by other companies; and the profits of this company will bear comparison with any other. A policy effected in 1849 for £1,000 at this low premium, was in 1883 worth £1,534. The other company, established in 1837, has made a still greater reduction in the premium. At age thirty, £2 1s. 6d., instead of £2 10s.; but the bonuses are on the *tontine* system—no profits are payable unless a member shall outlive his expectancy; say at age thirty, should he live thirty-four years, the average duration of life at that age, he would then fully participate in the profits when they are very large. At the last investigation, policies for £1000, sharing the first time, were increased to sums varying from £1,170 to £1,300; and policies which have shared before have been increased to £1,400, to £1,700, and upwards. This *tontine* system appears to be growing in favour, and many companies are adopting special tables on this plan.

We have in the Insurance Guide, published in 1857, a list of *improvements* which the author considered desirable and strongly recommended.

1. More moderate rates of premium.
2. Substitution of mixed for proprietary or non-bonus-giving offices.
3. Extension of the limits of foreign travelling.
4. Modification of conditions regarding death by suicide.
5. More liberal conditions regarding surrendered and lapsed policies.
6. Application of assurances to diseased lives.
7. Increasing and decreasing rates of premium.
8. Allowing portions of premium to remain at credit in exceptional cases.
9. Loans on policies for keeping them in force.
10. More prompt settlement of claims.

Here are ten subjects for the consideration of the offices, and it is a remarkable and very interesting fact that they have all been adopted by a large number of the largest and best companies, except the first, "*more moderate rates of premium.*" This must be very gratifying to Mr. Walford, who so many years ago made these important suggestions.

Within the last few months an important company announced in their annual report that they had adopted the following alterations and improvements for the benefit of the assured:—  
 "1. Claims should be paid immediately on proof of death.  
 2. Surrendered values shall be guaranteed. 3. Policies lapsed from non-payment of premium shall have policies of a liberal amount, free of future premium. 4. The surrender value of policies shall be held over for the assured for five years.  
 5. Inaccurate statements made in a proposal form shall not invalidate a claim, unless accompanied by fraud. 6. Policies shall be made world-wide if the assurer has attained a certain number of years." We are highly gratified to give such a long list of improvements, and this may be taken as a fair specimen of what other companies have done. It now only needs the other and first improvement mentioned in the list, "*more moderate rates of premium.*"

We have referred to the two offices which adopt low rates of premium, but what shall we say of the two other offices which, after five or seven years, reduce the premium for life from 50 to 65 per cent. One of the companies, for the first seven years, charges a large extra premium—at age thirty, £2 19s. 3d. instead of £2 9s. 2d.; but the premium is afterwards reduced to £1 0s. 8d. (65 per cent.), which is still further reduced from time to time. The other company charges for the first five

years the ordinary premium of £2 9s. 9d., and then reduces the premium to £1 4s. 10d.—50 per cent. ; and after twenty years reduces the premium 65 per cent. Both these companies are very wealthy, and have large reserve funds, so much so that the first company named paid their claims last year, amounting to £169,124, with the interest, £160,456, received on investments, within £9,000. What then becomes of the premiums received—£327,000? No less a sum than £212,000 was returned to members, and £78,000 added to the reserve fund. It needs no further argument to prove that the premiums are much higher than is absolutely necessary, and may at once be safely reduced, as well as after five or seven years: not 50 per cent.—we do not suggest such a reduction; but if the premiums can be safely and profitably reduced 50 per cent. after five years, surely they can be reduced 15 or 20 per cent. to commence with.

We have shown that the companies make a certain profit of £2,372,477 from increased interest and saving in the expenses, but the actual profit made by the reduced mortality by all the companies it is impossible to ascertain; yet we have a good indication of the profits from this source from the speech of the chairman of the company, recently delivered, on this point. He said: "The actual existence of the lives which have fallen in during the last quinquennium has exceeded the expectation. Taking ages from thirty-five to thirty-nine, the amount which we actually had to pay was £11,488, that which we might have been expected to pay was £33,000; from forty to forty-five we paid £34,500, and expected to have paid £42,000; from forty-five to fifty we paid £37,000, and expected to pay £59,000; from fifty to fifty-five we paid £75,000, and expected to have paid £88,000; from fifty-five to sixty we paid £60,000, and expected to have paid £101,000; from sixty to sixty-five we paid £145,000, and expected to have paid £180,000; from sixty-five to seventy we paid £225,000, and expected to have paid £289,000; and from seventy to seventy-five we paid £242,000, and expected to pay £331,000. The whole result is, that we have paid during the quinquennium about £100,000 less than we might have expected to have paid according to the table upon which the valuations have been made."

This more than agrees with all that we have said, and must be taken as an absolute proof of the greatly reduced mortality. We cannot say that every office would show such a favourable return as this; of course the directors take great credit for extraordinary care in the selection of lives. Just so; and that is an advantage which all life assurance companies have.

During the quinquennium the company paid in claims £1,837,202, and was prepared for and expected to have paid

£2,237,202; they therefore effected a saving in claims of nearly 18 per cent. Have all the other companies done so? The total amount paid in claims in 1884 was £11,720,535; if this sum was 18 per cent. less than the expectancy, the saving would be about £2,000,000, which undoubtedly accounts for the enormous bonuses the companies have been able to pay, for, added to the other sources of profit, it will make a certain and estimated profit exceeding £4,000,000 a year.

The present system of life assurance and the management of the companies are nearly perfect; let the premiums be reduced, and all that it is possible to be done for the further advantage of the public will be accomplished. We are at a loss to understand by what rule and under what circumstances there should be such a difference in the premiums at present charged by the various companies. Say at age thirty, we have the following rates for £100 annual premiums:—£2 13s. 5d.; £2 12s. 0d.; £2 11s. 0d.; £2 10s. 2d.; £2 9s. 2d.; £2 8s. 6d.; £2 7s. 7d.; £2 6s. 4d.; £2 5s. 9d.; £2 4s. 3d.; and all these companies pay large bonuses. The medium rate we may take at £2 9s. 2d., the difference between the highest and lowest being nearly 20 per cent. We have not included the premium of another company, £2 1s. 6d., because they give no profits until after about 30 or 34 years.

The business of the life assurance companies should be doubled. Although we have allowed a much higher number than is usual, yet instead of 30 per cent. only being assured, there should be 60 per cent., or at least one-half, 50 per cent.; there are 3,000,000 good lives yet to insure. Some of the companies do a large business. Last year one office granted new assurances exceeding £2,000,000; four offices did a little over £1,000,000 each; two did £800,000; three £700,000; six from £500,000 to £600,000; seven from £400,000 to £500,000; eleven from £300,000 to £400,000; twenty from £200,000 to £300,000; and fifteen under £200,000; the average being £438,000 for each company. We shall watch the record from time to time, and hope to see a very large increase in the number and amount of life assurances effected by all the offices every year.

---

## ART. II.—THE PARSEES.

1. *History of the Parsis, including their Manners, Customs, Religion, and Present Position.* By DOSABHAI FRAMJI KARAKA, C.S.I., Presidency Magistrate and Chairman of Her Majesty's Bench of Justices, Bombay. Two volumes. London : Macmillan & Co. 1884.
2. *The Sacred Books of the East.* Edited by F. MAX MÜLLER. Vols. IV. and XXIII. : The Zend-Avesta. Vol. V. : The Bundahis, Bahman Yast, and Shâyast-lâ-Shâyast. Vol. XVIII. : The Dâdistân-â-Dînîk, and Epistles of Mânûskihar. Oxford : The Clarendon Press. 1880-1884.
3. *Nouvelle Géographie Universelle. La Terre et les Hommes.* Par ÉLISÉE RECLUS. Tome IX. : L'Asie Antérieure. (Chap. iv. : La Perse.) Paris : Hachette. 1884.
4. *Histoire de la Religion des Banians, &c. Avec un traité de la Religion des anciens Persans ou Parsis, extrait d'un autre livre écrit en Persan, intitulé Zundavastav, &c.* Traduit de l'Anglois de HENRY LORD. A Paris, chez Robert de Niville, au bout du Pont S. Michel, au coin de la rue de la Huchette, à l'Escu de France et de Nauarre. M.DC.LXVII. Avec Privilège du Roy.

IN the 716th year of our era, a storm-buffed fleet of small coasting vessels crossed the Gulf of Cambay, and took refuge at Sanjan on the Mofussil seaboard. They carried a devoted remnant of the descendants of those Persians who seventy-five years before had, together with their Sassanian dynasty, been crushed for ever by Caliph Omar's Arabs at the battle of Nihavand. Their weak and wretched king, Yazdgard III., struggled on, a fugitive, for ten years longer. "Pursue him," was Omar's fiat, ere he himself was stabbed in the mosque by a Ghebr slave, "pursue him wherever he may go, until you have driven him from the face of the earth." Tradition relates that the conversion of the conquered Persians to Islam was forthwith carried on at the rate of a hundred thousand a day, and in less than two centuries the vast majority of the population had become Mahommedans. Hosts of recalcitrants were put to death, and others fled to the mountains of Korassan. Many, however, remained in Kirman—the Roman Carmania—and in the adjoining Farsistan, country of the Farsi or Parsi—Persis—probably the cradle of these former conquerors of Asia.

These are at the present day chiefly grouped, in a condition approaching misery, in Yezd and its outlying villages, 3,800 feet above the level of the sea, in the desert of the Khorud range, about 160 miles from Ispahan. But another considerable body fled to the coast and gained a refuge in the island of Ormuz, at the entrance of the Persian Gulf, where the scene of Moore's once familiar "Fire Worshippers" is laid. Here they were still within reach of the Moslems' sword, and did not long remain, but took ship for the neighbouring shores of India, with which Persia had for many ages maintained an intercourse. Round the name of their country, Iran, in the history of Western Asia, centre endless traditions of toil and intellectual culture. It recalls the long duration of powerful kingdoms which resisted the assaults of barbarous tribes for a succession of ages. Conscious and proud of their antiquity as an organized and politic race, the Persians always regarded the surrounding populations with contempt, as less cultivated or younger than themselves in the scale of civilization. The Shah-in-shah, the King of kings, the Greek's βασιλεύς βασιλέων, was famous at the Court of China. For the origin of their idioms the peoples of Aryan speech are taken back towards the lofty plains where the tongue miscalled Zend\* was first spoken, and from all time the language of Persia was for the neighbouring populations the leading civilized dialect. Even in our own days the Afghans and Balutchees affect to speak Persian, in order to take a higher place in the esteem of those who hear them.

The plateau of Iran, where it is compressed between the Persian Gulf on one side and the Caspian Sea on the other, is reduced by mountainous tracts to a practicable width of little more than 300 miles; and through this pass the peoples of numerous Eastern races have ever had to work their westward progress. From earliest historic times we find Turanian populations wrestling with Aryans on these plains. The traditions of these immortal struggles supplied that most stirring portion of Firdusi's great epic, the Book of Kings, the Shah-Namah, where he narrates the mythic feats and the mighty encounters in which Zal and his great son Rustam, and the whole family of heroes born of their loins, at length overthrew their bitter enemies. In ancient historic days the Medes and the Persians, in more modern times the Turks and the Farsis, amid various

---

\* The word *zend* simply means commentary or explanation, and must have been first given to the language in which was composed the Avesta (from old Persian *ābastā*, law) in pure ignorance. "Avestan" would be a good substitute. The references to the Zend Avesta throughout this article are to the text of Westergaard and Darmesteter.

other ethnic elements in process of fusion in the country, have represented these two great races of Central Asia. And here we have a handful of the one fleeing from the fanaticism of the other.

The fugitives first touched at Diu, at the mouth of the Cambay Gulf—the same that was taken for the Portuguese eight centuries later by Nugna d'Acunha, in 1535—and here they are said to have rested for nineteen years. They next removed to Sanjan, as above, attracted by the wise and liberal rule of one Jadi Rana, and there they fixed themselves, built a fire-temple, and lived in peace for 600 years. During this long interval they spread, with their adventurous spirit, to many parts of India, notably to the towns along the adjoining coasts. Al Istakhiri, a Mahommedan traveller of the middle of the ninth century, mentions these Ghebrs—as the Moslems generally called them—as occupying parts of Hind and Sind; a traveller of the twelfth century speaks of them as “rich, warlike, wandering, and clever.” When Timar invaded India, towards the end of the fourteenth century, he was resisted at Tughlikhpur by Parsees, and the fugitives from his vengeance served to swell the colonies of Gujarat. Sir H. Elliot, in his “History of India,” supports Professor Dowson’s view, that the Maghs of Tughlikhpur as well as the Ghebrs of Rohilkand and the Magyas of Malwa are relics of these old upper-Indian Parsees, notwithstanding that they exhibit no trace whatever of their ancient faith and customs. Mr. Dosabhai gives some other tales of the “lost tribes” category (i. 93) which need not detain us. At the beginning of the fourteenth century, with their usual loyalty to the rulers under whom they may dwell, they assisted the Rana of Sanjan against the Mahommedan forces of Alp or Ulugh Khan, but their hereditary foes again prevailed, and the Sanjan Parsees fled to the mountains, whence, after an interval of ten years—but all this is mere tradition, set down as late as 1600 by a Parsee priest—they ventured to Bansda, and fourteen years later, in 1331, to Nowsari, where their co-religionists had been long established, and there Akbar made grants of land to their Dastur or high-priest in 1595; and it was under Akbar’s peaceful rule that their long pent-up energies first found an opportunity of development.

It was at neighbouring Surat that this industrious and persevering race laid the foundations of their extraordinary modern prosperity. The earliest mention of them in this city of the Great Mogul is found in 1478, and as soon as European trading companies were set up there they came to the front as brokers. Being free from all share in the caste prejudices of the Hindoos, among whom they lived on good terms, and



having a keen eye to business, they at once and naturally became the middlemen between the native merchants and the Portuguese, Dutch, English, and French factories, as is sufficiently plain from Henry Lord's book, written at the time, after eighteen years residence at Surat with the President of the English company. One Rastam Manak, who was well regarded by Aurang-Zeb, rose to high consideration as chief broker of the English factory there, which was indebted to him at his decease in 1721 to the extent of 550,000 rupees. In 1800, when the East India Company took Surat from the Nawab, a Parsee, Dhanjisha Beheremandkhan, was appointed native agent of four small neighbouring States, and lost his life in 1810, combating a false Mahdi of those days and parts, one Abdul Rehman, who was threatening Surat from Bodhan near by. Upon the decadence of Surat as a commercial centre, the Parsees mostly removed thence to the island of Bombay, where indeed some of them had settled prior to the cession of that now important place to England in 1668, as the dowry of Katharine of Braganza. There we found Dorabji Nanabhai who had been in the habit of transacting miscellaneous business between the Portuguese and the natives. He continued so to act for us, and was succeeded by his son Rastamji Dorabji. In 1692 the plague broke out, most of the garrison and of the European inhabitants succumbed; and the Sidis of Janjira, who were then a powerful and independent people, taking advantage of the juncture, organized bands of pirates along the Malabar coast and invaded Bombay, taking possession of the island and of Dungry Fort, now Fort George; the handful of English spared by the plague being exhausted and helpless. But Rastamji, who doubtless had in his veins some of the blood of the Persian warrior caste of old, raised the fishermen, who then formed the chief portion of the local population, encountered the invaders and defeated them. He then sent messengers to the head of the English factory at Surat, who soon arrived and took charge of the government. For this service Rastamji received the title of Patel or headman, and was placed over the caste of fishermen, with the power of adjusting disputes among them as a sort of *juge de paix*, an authority which his descendants are stated in some degree to enjoy to this day, together with the title or surname of Patel. Mr. Dosabhai says that from that time up to within forty years ago, "the whole of the European trade of the port of Bombay passed through the hands of the Parsees as middlemen in one shape or another." Besides that, a few generations after they settled in the island they commenced trading to Bengal, Burmah, the Straits of Malacca, Java, the Mauritius, and China, in some of whose ports Parsee firms were

established. Indeed the bulk of the Bombay business with China, including the valuable opium trade, was, until about the same period of forty years ago, entirely in their hands, and they owned many of the ships on that line. Much of the immense wealth of the leading Bombay Parsees was derived from this Chinese trade, and the modern initiative in this direction was taken by the Readymoney family in the early part of the last century. It was thus that the Bombay Parsees came to be so far in advance of any other portion of their race in wealth, intelligence, and civilization. The fact is, and it is very much to the credit of their cool clear-headedness, that as soon as they had observed the English for some little time in India, they had the shrewdness to pick them out as the best colonists, and, in the language of Capel Court, to "follow" them. The result is that more than half of the Parsees of India (85,937) are now congregated in Bombay itself, where in 1881 they numbered 48,597 out of a total population of 723,196.

In their relations to Europeans, the Indian Parsees seem to afford an historical parallel to the conduct of the Haikans or Armenians towards the Crusaders. "Separated from the other communions of Asia by insurmountable antipathies," says M. de Mas Latrie, "the Armenians recognized the superiority of the Latin race. They respected the valour and piety of these same men whom the Greeks treated as unbelievers and barbarians, and their rare aptitude for trade led them naturally to settle in the seaports."\* The persecutions of the Armenians too have been very great at the hands of the Moslem, and they are still, seven centuries after the Crusaders, the intelligent and laborious aids of the Europeans in the East. Any one who has seen the two races—the Parsees and the Armenians—and grasped their "types," can scarcely fail to hazard an ethnological parallel also.

In Surat there are 6,227 Parsees, in Broach 2,088, and 25,179 are divided among various towns of Gujarat and other places in the Bombay Presidency, which thus includes a total of 82,091 Parsees; the rest of India having only 3,306. Mr. Dosabhai computes the whole number of persons now on the globe professing the ancient Zoroastrian faith and customs to be: India over 85,000, Persia about 8,000,† China and elsewhere 3,000—total 96,000; and he gives some interesting population statistics of the Bombay Parsees. Between 1872 and 1881 they increased ten in the hundred, notwithstanding constant emigration. Their death-rate (19·26) is the lowest of any race or caste in Bombay;

---

\* "*Histoire de Chypre*," i. 106.

† The census of 1879, according to M. Elisée Reclus, gave 8,188.

the Europeans coming next with 20·18, and then the Brahmans with 20·4, and so on up to the Jains, whose death-rate was as high as 54·47 in 1881-82. The largest percentage of children under one year of age (4·09) is among the Parsees, the Eurasians coming next with 3·77; then the Hindoo low castes, 3·54; next the Jews, 3·44; and the lowest proportion of all is that of the Buddhists, which is but 0·59.

Led at first by an enlightened minority, the Parsees have seized with avidity on the advantages of education which the humanity of English Liberalism has struggled so hard, against Conservative opposition of all kinds, to afford to the natives of India. Although the Hindoos of Bombay are over ten times as numerous as the Parsees, the Parsee pupils at the Elphinstone Institution have never been less than those of the Hindoos, and have often exceeded them. Since the Bombay University was established in 1857, upwards of 1,000 Parsees have matriculated, and they have frequently passed for the covenanted Civil Service, the first place at the final examination of the 1882 students last year having been taken by Mr. Mancherji Pestanji Kharegat. "Over fifteen years of age, the smallest proportion of illiterate, either male or female," say the census returns of 1881, "is found in the Parsee population." The boys of the rising generation are all receiving an English education, be they rich or poor, and it will be an eternal honour to the Parsees that they were the first natives of India to move, and they moved spontaneously, in the education of women. Before 1849, when the first girl-schools were opened, instruction was confined to the daughters of the better classes, who just learned to read and write a little of their vernacular Gujaratee. But "the young men who had been educated in Government schools and colleges felt the inferiority of their better halves. They perceived that if the seeds of education were to be generally spread they should first germinate with the gentler sex" ("Hist. Parsis," i. 305). A student's literary and scientific society was started, discussions on the subject appeared in newspapers and magazines, and lectures were delivered. A Girls School Association was formed in 1857; and the instruction given in Gujaratee now consists of reading, writing, ciphering, needlework, "useful knowledge adapted to Parsee females," Zoroastrian morality, grammar, geography, and Indian and Persian history. The English language, too, is now beginning to find a place. But the most astonishing fact of all is that there are now four Parsee young ladies who have bravely faced all difficulties, including the caste and social embarrassments of the East, and are studying medicine in the Grant College, side by side with six European girls and the ordinary male medical students.

It is of importance to note the professions followed by this interesting population. In the first place, it is a leading fact that out of 9,584 Bombay beggars only six are Parsees. Industrial callings engross 3,697, commercial pursuits occupy 3,319, and 1,999 belong to the professional classes; only 67 follow the plough, and the remainder come under the heads "domestic" (2,495), "indefinite," and "miscellaneous;" 855 are ecclesiastics of various grades, 141 are schoolmasters and 34 schoolmistresses; while of the 84 civil engineers of Bombay as many as 33 are Parsees. There are also Parsee judges, magistrates, physicians, surgeons, civil servants, barristers, attorneys, and pleaders. In connection with the subject of education, it is important to observe that the first founder of Gujaratee type was a Parsee, and the first newspaper in that tongue—the Bombay *Samachar*—was also started by one of the community, father of the present proprietors of the *Daftur Ashkara* press, the *Rast Goftar* newspaper, and other periodicals. The first Gujaratee magazine, too, was started by a Parsee, and the first native compositor in English, and the first native reporter upon the staff of an English newspaper were Parsees; while the reporter subsequently became sub-editor and manager. Among the 159 dubashes or ship's compradores are 146 Parsees, and it is especially noteworthy what an extraordinary turn they have always developed for shipbuilding, taking as naturally to that and all other ancillaries of ocean trading as webbed feet do to water, having completely laid aside, if it ever existed, the prejudice against defiling the sea which Pliny imputed to them.\* In 1735 we find one Danjibhai a master-builder at Surat. Soon afterwards his foreman shipwright, Lavji Nasarvanji, was brought to Bombay by the East India Company, to establish a building yard there. He brought his sons Manakji and Bamanji up to the craft, and he and they became in the course of years well known all over India. His grandsons Framji and Jamshedji also followed the trade, and the post of master-builder to the government at Bombay, an important one while "wooden walls" and the teak of the western slopes of the Ghauts held their own, became hereditary in their family. During the century and a half that has since elapsed this family has built "335 new vessels, including many men-of-war, besides repairing innumerable ships;" and the post of master-builder, still held

\* "Navigare noluerunt, quoniam inspuere in maria, aliisque mortalium necessitatibus violare, fas non putant" (Pliny, l. i.). When a Hindoo is compelled to take a voyage it is not uncommon for his nearest relatives to throw milk into the sea as an offering (Monier Williams: "Religious Thought and Life in India," p. 349).

by Jamshedji Dhanjibhai, will not be abolished until his retirement. As government contractors, too, whether to the army, or for railways or public works, they have been enterprising and successful. They followed our forces to Cabul, and they are now to be found as shopkeepers in almost every city of India, "ready to take advantage," says Mr. Dosabhai, "of every opportunity." Thus they do not confine their attentions to Europeans alone. Rather more than 10,000 of the total Parsee population of India inhabit the native States, the bulk of these being settled in the territories of the Gaikwar of Baroda. Nowsari or Navsari, already mentioned as one of the earliest of their colonies, and still the headquarters of the priesthood, lies outside direct British jurisdiction.

Mr. Dosabhai's volumes are filled with biographical records of the numerous well-known Parsees whose public spirit and lavish charity have been displayed in so extraordinary a manner in our days. In this they rival and outstrip the Hindoos; indeed the vastness of the good works done by this small community is almost fabulous, and for the most part wholly unsectarian and, to apply Comte's term to a race that knows not Comte, purely altruistic. It may be read of at length in Mr. Dosabhai's "History," but we can do no more here than draw general attention to the subject, for were we to begin an account of all the acts of rare benevolence, and all the munificent gifts made all over the world for public objects from their hard-earned fortunes, by men whose names have long been familiar in India and in England, space would utterly fail to complete it.

We have seen how infinitesimal a proportion of the Bombay population is occupied in agriculture. It would almost seem as if but few or none of the ancient Persian caste of husbandmen were among the fugitives of the eighth century. Indeed it would be but natural that the soldiers, the priests, and the wealthier classes should have been most closely pursued, while the tillers of the soil would, as in their other conquests, have been retained in their own interest by the Moslem Arabs, who have never developed much agricultural propensity themselves. However this may be, the Persian Parsees of the present day are almost wholly an agricultural population, while their Indian fellows are essentially townsmen. Of the 8,000 Zoroastrians or Zardushti of Persia, 6,500 are now confined to Yezd—at the same time the "city of light" and the Manchester of Persia—and its twenty-four surrounding villages, where they possess thirty-four fire-temples, great and small. Among them

are a few traders and artisans, but by far the greater number earn their scanty bread as gardeners and cotton-growers; and the paltry sum of their gains may be imagined when the weaver of a wondrous Persian shawl has to be content with seven halfpence a day.\* At Kirman there are, according to the 1879 census, 1,500 of them (Mr. Dosabhai says 450) remaining out of the 12,000 families mentioned at the end of the eighteenth century; at Shiraz a few are shopkeepers; and there are about 150 more settled as merchants at Teheran. In the gardens adjoining the harem of the Shah none but Zoroastrians are employed as gardeners, because of their good moral character says Mr. Dosabhai; and he might have added that at the English ambassador's summer village of Gulhek, which is a paradisc of trees and flowers, all the gardeners are Parsees. In the tenth century, when Ibn Hokal travelled, every village in Persia still had its fire-temple, its priests, and its sacred writings. The numerous mounds of the country, due to erosion by water in geological time, are in the eyes of the present natives remains of the towns of the fire-worshippers, and are still called Ghebrabad, dwellings of the Ghebrs. But four revolutions in Persia within the last 200 years have conduced to their destruction. Even as late as 150 years ago these Irani Parsees are said to have numbered 100,000. They suffered heavily from the Persian troops during the invasion of the Ghilji Afghans, whose standard they joined; about a century since, when Aga Mohammed Khan Kujur conquered Kirman, many of them were put to the sword. But during all their vicissitudes and through all their forced conversions, a faithful remnant of Parsees has clung devotedly to the form of faith bequeathed to them by their far ancestors—a fact which becomes of much significance when contrasted with the more or less easy conversion to Islam, 1100 years ago, of the great mass of the Persian nation.

One of the numerous oppressions under which the Irani Parsees labour is the confiscation of the whole property of a family in favour of any individual member of it who may become a renegade. This is doubtless one of the main causes of the constant, continuous, abasement of this community, and oddly enough it was a favourite expedient employed not so very long ago, under the title of "bills of discovery," by the English Protestant Christians against their brethren the mere Irish Roman Christians. But for all their down-trodden condition, the Ghebrs of Yezd are, says M. Elisée Reclus, noted for the scrupulosity with which they keep their word, exhibiting in this

---

\* Gasteiger: "Von Kirman nach Baludschistan."

important respect a quality which is generally to be sought for in vain among oppressed and fallen nationalities; and this is the more remarkable as Mr. Dosabhai says that "modern writers have noticed prominently the want of this essential trait of truthfulness in the present Mahommedans of Persia."

Such is the condition of this stubborn progeny of the ancient Persians who inherited the glories of the Assyrian and Babylonian empires, spreading their dominion from the isles of Greece to the table-land of Tibet, and from the Caspian to the confines of India. A few anthropological particulars will not be out of place, and would serve, were there nothing else to do so, to link this remnant with its glorious past. Five skulls of Yezd Parsees, brought to Europe by Khanikoff, have been studied by Baer. They are very long-headed, the brain capacity being considerable, with an index of 0.70. The head is flattened on the top, and lower than the Semitic skull, although higher than the Turanian; the sculptures of Darabgerd, which are 1600 years old, exhibit the same peculiarity. The general height of the Persians falls short of five feet (59.05 inches), so that Mr. Dosabhai is scarcely borne out in saying (i. 120) that the stature of the Parsees of India has been lowered by inter-marriage and early unions. The hands and feet are small and flexible, the bones are slender, and the joints small. The Persian infantry astonish their modern foreign instructors by the lengthy marches they can make without apparent fatigue,\* and this may be one of the secrets of their ancient conquests.

We see with regret that Mr. Dosabhai takes a somewhat gloomy view of the present commercial outlook of the Bombay Parsees. Shortly after the China war ceased in 1842, up to which time they had almost monopolized the China trade with India, they began to encounter rivalry, at first from the Khojas and other Mahommedan merchants of Bombay, and subsequently from the Jews of that place and of Calcutta, who took advantage of the opening of the ports, and, "being keener and more highly educated men of business, succeeded in gradually displacing the Parsees in the China trade." Cotton too, at the end of the American civil war, and a share mania brought ruin later on to many Parsee houses. In addition to this, the native merchants and dealers, the Baniyachs and Bhatiyachs, who are chiefly Hindoos of Katch and Kathiawar, have so far advanced under English tuition in education and general knowledge that they can now deal directly with Europeans, and so the Parsee

---

\* "Nouv. Géog Univ." ix, 194.

middleman is no longer the indispensable factor in trade that he used to be in days gone by. But a race that has proved itself so hardy and successful during the last 200 years, and which, when English rule gave it a chance, after ages of what may be justly termed suspended animation, evidenced a latent vitality so phenomenal as to be comparable to that of the Egyptian "mummy wheat," will scarcely allow itself long to be outstripped; and it may be safely predicted that, aided by their upright ways and their fervour for education, they will surely find other outlets for their energy and perseverance.

The first thing to note as to the mode of life of the Indian Parsees is that this small body has not been surrounded for so many centuries by a vast and dense Hindoo and Moslem population without being considerably influenced thereby. Tradition says that at their advent in Sanjan in the eighth century they at once, from politic motives, conformed to the Hindoo usages and dress—even the peculiar Parsee hat, so well known in the city of London, has been copied from the Baniyahs. They also adopted the Gujaratee tongue, to the gradual extinction of the Persian, and even misrepresented their religious tenets to the Rana, colouring them so as to curry favour with the native population.\* At the present day the Parsees of Persia, to please the Moslems, give out that their Zerdusht or Zoroaster is the same personage that the Jews, Christians, and Musulmans call Abraham; † and it is evident from Henry Lord's book that the same and other similar deceptions were practised upon him at Surat more than 200 years since. Then the European influence during the last 250 years has been powerful; so much so that Mr. Dosabhai now pronounces the mode of life of the superior class of Parsee in India to be half European and half Hindoo—Eurasian in fact. But their hold upon the essentials of their past is wonderfully tenacious. Their era still commemorates, nay, prolongs the reign of their last monarch, the wretched Yazdgard, for they reckon their years from his accession in A.D. 632, the reign of each monarch having commenced a new era. The hold of the Parsees upon the past is the more extraordinary as until 1837 and 1865, when they obtained their Chattels Real, Succession, and Marriage and Divorce Acts, they had been living as a community for more than a thousand years without a written law or record of ancient usages to

---

\* "Hist. Parsis," i. 31.

† De Gobineau: "Religions et Philosophies dans l'Asie centrale."



govern their social relations. If they ever possessed a code of their own—which is not in any way proved—it must have been lost on their expatriation with all their religious books. Respect for ancient traditions and beliefs alone kept them together, and this in itself is a sufficiently remarkable fact about the race.

Patriarchal usage is still perpetuated in the way in which a Parsee family keeps together. Though a father may have six or seven sons, they all, when they are married, live with their wives and children in the paternal home; exceptional separations being generally due to "domestic quarrels among the wives of brothers or with the mother-in-law." The astrologer with his star- and folk-lore occupies some important niches in the life of a Parsee. At birth a member of the family is told off to take the exact time to a second of the child's appearance by a carefully regulated watch or clock. On the sixth night of its little life, paper, pen and ink, with some red powder and a cocoanut as an offering, are placed by the bedside, so that "the goddess who presides over the child" may record its destiny. A few days afterwards a joshî or astrologer—a Brahman, Hindoo, or Parsee, it is not of much consequence which—is called in to cast the babe's nativity from the carefully recorded time of its birth. This he does with chalk on a board—what a downfall from the mystic majesty that still shrouds the Magi of old!—and then and there he gives out the names which the child may bear, according to their affinity with the stars which were in the ascendant at its birth. The parents then choose one from among these names, and it is given without further ceremony. The Parsees having as a rule no surnames, the son adds to his own single name, given as above, the name which was similarly given to his father. Thus, if he be named Ardeshir, and his father was named Framji,\* he would always be known as Ardeshir Framji. If his child, again, be named Pestanji, he would in the same way be distinguished as Pestanji Ardeshir; and in the following generation the name might be Jchangir Pestanji. Thus a grandfather's name is not preserved or entailed beyond his son, and vanishes from the name of his grandson. As the number of names which may be taken is limited for men to about forty-nine of Persian and twenty of Hindoo origin, there are always many persons bearing identical

\* Mr. Dosabhai does not tell us anything about the ending, -ji. Professor Monier Williams says that this honorific syllable is often added to the name by the Hindoos, as in Rāmaji (Rāmji), Sivaji, Devaji. It is probably thought to be auspicious, as derived from either the root *jiv*, to live, or *ji*, to conquer. So that this is another instance of conformity to Hindoo usages by the Parsees.

names; and to lessen confusion it became a custom to take as an *atak*, or distinguishing suffix, the name of a man's calling. For instance, Manakji, the son of Kavasji, a carpenter (*sutar*), will call himself Manakji Kavasji Sutar; but if his son Jamshedji becomes an attorney, he will be called Jamshedji Manakji Vakil. Mr. Dosabhai gives a list of all the possible Parsee names; we wish he had added their signification and the stars to which they bear affinity.

To return to the infant Parsee. The astrologer draws out its horoscope, and gets from four to ten shillings for his trouble. The next event in the child's life, whether boy or girl, is the investiture, any time after the age of six years and three months,\* with the *sadarah* and *kosti*, the holy shirt and girdle. The ceremony lasts about an hour, and is calculated to impress the mind of the child, who drinks thrice of "the sacred *nirangdin* or *gomez*,† chews a pomegranate leaf, and goes through the *palet*, or prayer of repentance, with two priests. He also makes the profession of faith—

Praise be to the Mazdayasnian religion created by the holiness, the purity, and the wisdom of Ormazd. The good, righteous, right religion which the Lord has sent to his creatures is that which Zoroaster has brought. The religion is the religion of Zoroaster; the religion of Ormazd given to Zoroaster.

Then the priest delivers the *hosban*, a homily in praise of honesty, truth, and purity; and the ceremony winds up by throwing over the neophyte's head a mixture of rice, almonds, and fragments of cocoa-nut.‡ This *sadarah* is a light, short, muslin garment, worn next the body; and the *kosti* is a thin woollen cord of 72 threads, passed thrice round the waist and tied with four knots. The wearer in tying the first knot says: "There is only one God, and no other is to be compared with him;" at the second knot he repeats, "The religion

\* This should really be stated at seven years, for the nine months of gestation are reckoned in the child's life, as Mr. Dosabhai does not explain.

† Ox's urine. It is constantly used in the Parsee ritual for the purification of the unclean, and strangely enough the practice has recently been detected in Lower Brittany (Mélusine, 493). It comes from all that old class of myths which conceived the storm-floods that cleanse the sky of the dark fiends, the clouds, as being the *gomez* of a gigantic bull in the heavens. The ox alone does not supply the *gomez*, see Vendidad, viii. 13. For the Hindoo, the best of all holy water is the *gomez* of the cow, so that the conception is not confined to the Iranians (Monier Williams: "Religious Thought and Life in India," p. 318).

‡ Of all fruits the most sacred in the eye of the Hindoo is the cocoa-nut. It is called the fruit of the goddess of prosperity, Sri-phala (Monier Williams: "Religious Thought and Life in India," p. 339).

given by Zoroaster is true;" at the third, "Zoroaster is the prophet who derived his mission from Ormazd;" and at the last knot he says, "Perform good actions and abstain from evil ones." It is impossible to read this without thinking first of the Moslem profession of faith: "There is no God but God. Mohammed is the Apostle of God;" and then of the yajnopavita and mekhalâ, the sacred cord and girdle of the Brahmans; and the scapular, consisting of cords passing over the shoulders, which is so generally worn by devout Roman Christians—especially women and children—in honour of the mother of Jesus Christ. The Zoroastrian, as soon as he has risen from sleep, must put on his *kosti*, wash his hands, and put wood on the fire. His girdle binds him both to Ormazd and to his co-believers, and he thus becomes a participator in the merit of all the good performed all over the Zoroastrian world—which is just the Christian communion of saints.

The astrologer has no place in the investiture ceremony, which may be contrasted with the Christian rite or sacrament of confirmation, but he takes the lead in marriages. The horoscopes of both boy and girl—for early marriages are the rule—are handed over to him, and if their stars are not in harmony he vetoes the match. If however he pronounces in favour of it, betrothal is forthwith effected by the mere exchange between the parents of new dresses for the boy and girl, which renders the marriage contract *pucka* or complete. The astrologer names the happy day, and as certain days of the year are especially propitious, a great number of marriages often take place together, somewhat like the English rush into wedlock after lent, and we must not forget the ancient prejudice against marriages in May. Marriages among near relations are much practised. A very ancient Persian custom this, to be found also among the Japanese and the Peruvians, and connected with the cosmogony of sun-worship.\* All over Mahomedan Persia at the present day the first marriages are if possible made between cousins-german, and it is a noteworthy fact that, notwithstanding the extraordinary facility of divorce,† such marriages are rarely broken. There is little doubt that next-of-kin marriages are orthodox and Zoroastrian. The lost sixteenth nosk or volume of the Avesta treated of the subject, and one of the virtuous actions rewarded in heaven is marriage among relations (*khvaytôdath*), while one of the sins punish-

\* See on this subject the WESTMINSTER REVIEW, October 1884, p. 538.

† Few Persian women reach the age of twenty-four without having had two or three husbands; and even temporary unions for twenty-five days or less are blessed by the Mollahs (De Gobineau: "Trois Ans en Asie").

able with hell is the violation of a next-of-kin marriage by the wife. Almost all Ghebr marriages in Persia are made between near relatives; still it has not been remarked that they become inferior in purity of blood or beauty of feature, and M. Elisée Reclus adds with truth that on the whole the Persians are, of all the nations on the globe, those that approach nearest to the perfect type of beauty as a European eye judges it.\* The excellent coloured portraits in Mr. Dosabhai's volumes serve well to accentuate the remark. The Zoroastrian law is said to forbid marriage before the age of fifteen, and the practice among the Irani Parsees at the present day is not to marry a girl before that age, or a young man before twenty; but the Hindoos are strictly enjoined by their Shastras to have their daughters married before they reach the age of nine, and until very recently the Parsees of India conformed generally to this custom, which, since girl-schools have been established, cuts short their education at an untimely age; but there has been for some time a strong movement against it among the influential minority of the Parsee public. It should be remarked that there was a considerable tendency to bigamy—as a step perhaps towards polygamy—before the passing of the Parsee Marriage Act of 1865.

The next important ceremony in a man's life, unless he becomes a priest, is the preparation for death, and this to outsiders wears an appearance almost of barbarity. "When the case is seen to be hopeless," instead of letting the unfortunate moribund die in peace, he is taken and washed all over with gomez, and dressed in clean clothes, while the priests repeat prayers and Avesta texts. Here still, possibly, we get further back towards the origin of Christian "extreme unction;" at all events we have a clear parallel to it. When life is extinct the feet are tied together—an old relic of the practice of attaching the body to the place of exposure—the hands are joined, and the body is laid on the ground-floor. A priest remains by it, saying prayers and burning sandal-wood, until the bearers† come for its transfer to the *dakhma* or "tower of silence," which is effected with all possible speed. As soon as the bearers arrive the seven parts of the Ahurian hymn are chanted, to combat the power of death, the brood of the fiend, the *drughsh*, which has come forth from hell to seize the man who has just died, and which from his corpse threatens the living near it as from a

\* "Nouv. Géog. Univ." ix. 193.

† These corpse-bearers (*nasesalars*) are of course horribly unclean in the eyes of the Parsees, and remain apart in a *nasakhana*, where the biers too are kept. They correspond very much to the now extinct Japanese lowest class of *eta*.

[Vol. CXXIV. No. CCXLVII.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LXVIII. No. I. C

stronghold. The Greek going out of a house where a dead man lay sprinkled himself with water from the ἀρδανίον at the door, to drive away death; and the Vedic Aryan, while burning a corpse, cried aloud: "Away, O death! hurt not our sons, our men!"\* During the chanting of the Ahurian hymn a dog is made to gaze thrice upon the face of the dead. This is called performing the *sag-did*, and Mr. Dosabhai says the exact object and meaning of this truly extraordinary proceeding has not been properly ascertained; but if we admit the theory that religious ritual is developed from mythology, the *sag-did* can certainly be illustrated if not explained. In the Rig-Veda the two watch-dogs of Yama—the son of Vivasvat, the first man, and therefore the first, the king, of the dead—guard the ways to the realm of death,† and the Avestan Yima, the son of Vivanghat, may almost be called Yama's twin-brother. Parsee tradition too makes dogs watch at the bridge which leads from this to the next world,‡ and with their barking drive away the fiend from the souls of the holy ones, lest he should drag them to hell. The conclusion is all but resistless that in the Parsee *sag-did* we have the outcome of a perfect faith in this myth, and a forestalling in this world, a making sure, of the good offices of the mystical dog in the next.

No sooner is the Ahurian hymn over than the body is taken off by the bearers on an iron bier to the dakhma, where it is exposed—"the eyes towards the sun," and "clothed only with the light of heaven"§—to the vultures, who are said to denude the bones of flesh at farthest in about an hour; a practice which in reality need not shock the feelings of Westerns more than the surface burial, and its consequences the dogs and jackals, of Mahomedan cemeteries. At the same time, there are numerous texts of the Vendidad (vi. 45; vii. 3; viii. 10, &c.) which admit of no doubt that in ancient times, before closed

\* Rig-Veda, x. 18, 1.

† Rig-Veda, x. 14, 10 *seq.* It is almost needless to remind the reader here of the three-headed Kerberos who watches at the doors of hell. The Egyptian jackal-headed Anubis was the guardian of Hades.

‡ Vendidad, xiii. 9; xix. 30. This bridge-myth is also familiar as the Sirath bridge of Mussulman superstition, and is at the bottom of the popular belief that ghosts cannot pass running water. In Thom's "Anecdotes" is mentioned a Yorkshire song about "the brig o' Dread, na brader than a thread." "Mélusine" (p. 70) gives a French superstition, from the Nièvre, of a little board which was put by Saint-Jean d'Archange between earth and paradise—

Pas pu longue, pas pu large  
Qu'un ch'veu de la Sainte Viargc.

We have no space here for the evidence that connects these superstitions with those about the Milky Way.

§ Vendidad, v. 13. 14; vi. 51.

dakhmas were adopted, the dog shared the office of the vulture, and Mr. Dosabhai quotes from Odericus, the Italian monk who travelled in India in the fourteenth century, a passage which says that at that recent date the Parsees of Thana then carried their dead with great pomp to the fields, and cast them to the beasts and birds to be devoured (i. 40).<sup>\*</sup> The denuded skeletons in the dakhma soon become perfectly desiccated by the influences of a tropical climate, and are then thrown into the deep central pit of the tower, where they crumble and are washed away by the copious rains; rich and poor thus mingling after death on equal terms.

The spot in the house where the body was laid is washed with gomez, and as the soul does not leave earth for three days, a priest remains in the room, praying and burning sandal-wood constantly during that time; and there too the female members of the family, seated on a carpet, receive the visits and consolations of their friends during the same three days. On the fourth day, when the soul is in heaven, garments are offered which it will wear in its celestial life.

Among the many interesting things in Mr. Dosabhai's book are the plans and explanations of a dakhma, which is the first building erected by Parsees where they make a settlement. It is of course open at the top, and consists of a circular wall of hard stone covered with white lime-plaster. This wall is from twenty to thirty feet high outside, and eight feet inside. Mr. Dosabhai affronts a gruesome subject when he claims for this mode of disposing of the dead the advantage that a Parsee can never be buried alive. On the other hand, no case of the escape from a dakhma of a resuscitated person has ever occurred, which appears somewhat strange when we consider the haste with which bodies are conveyed there. Mr. Dosabhai scoffs at the absurd tales current among the Parsees themselves about the corpse-bearers knocking them on the head if they revive. The dakhmas are naturally the haunts of myriads of fiends.

A dakhma ought to be rebuilt every fifty years, and it is technically considered, by a very transparent fiction—the use of iron pegs and an encircling thread in the four days consecration ceremony—not to pollute the earth. Now the whole

\* It is especially worthy of attention that the puzzling Kafirs of the Hindoo Koosh, who have been driven to the mountains because they will not become Shi'ite Mohammedans, expose their dead on the hills (Sir A. Burnes's "Narrative of a Journey to Kabul," 1842). These Kafirs speak an Aryan dialect nearly related to Sanskrit, and their religion is of the Vedic family; but, like the Parsees, they will not blow the fire with the mouth, and they maintain a perpetual fire with pious care ("Nouv. Géog. Univ." ix. 76).

object of exposure in the "tower of silence" is maintained to be the avoidance of the pollution of the earth by interment. At the creation "came Ahriman, who is all death, and he counter-created by his witchcraft a sin for which there is no atonement—the burying of the dead" (Vend. i. 13). Throughout the Zoroastrian writings that remain this is continually dwelt on. But cremation is an even greater crime, and if worshippers of Ormazd come upon a fire on which a corpse is burning,\* "they shall kill the man that burns the corpse; surely shall they kill him" (Vend. viii. 74). In Strabo's time it was a capital offence.† The ostensible reason now given for this prohibition and for this severity is the exceeding holiness and purity of fire, which must not be polluted. But the Vendidad (xviii. 70) prescribes as an atonement for sin the offering up of the entrails of cattle to the sacred Bahram fire,‡ and fire is daily and freely used for cooking other flesh, and the earth is not polluted by the bodies of any other animals but man and the dog. Mr. Dosabhai and previous modern writers lay great stress upon the wonderful sanitary views put into the shape of law by Zoroaster in these prohibitions, but it is assuming a little too much to carry back our nineteenth-century almost brand-new notions on sanitation into the far dim past of semi-barbarous empires.§ There can be little doubt that the whole Zoroastrian system was aimed at idolatry and sacrifices to idols and false gods, that it had to fight very much the same battle which the Christians fought against the pagans of the declining Roman Empire; but over and above that, Zoroastrianism doubtless had to struggle with human sacrifices and their corollary cannibalism, and did so by branding both with infamy, and fencing the dead human body round with such awful horrors and observances as should, once they had gained

\* The words are "a corpse-burning fire whereon a corpse is being cooked or roasted." Having directed that the offender is to be forthwith killed, the text adds: "They shall take off the cauldron, they shall take off the tripod." Very significant passages for the argument developed above.

† Strabo, xv. 14; Herodotus, iii. 16.

‡ "Ascending six steps, they showed me, in a room adjoining to the temple, their fire, which they fed with wood, and sometimes burn on it the fat of the sheep's tail" (Dr. G. F. Gemelli: "A Voyage Round the World," 1698).

§ It is admitted by the Parsees themselves that the cast-iron observances that surround women in childbed are eminently unhealthy both for the mother and the child ("Hist. Parsis," i. 157). See too Vendidad, viii. 13, as to the gomez. It is impossible to apply the term "sanitary" to such usages. The 99,999 diseases created by Ahriman were, like all his other works, in the category of uncleanness, but the best means for curing them were prayer, spells, and washing in gomez (Vend. vii. 44; xxii. 6 *seq.*, and the Ardibehesht Yasht). And uncleanness from contact with a dead human body was the worst and most terrible of all.

root-hold in the mind, for ever terminate the detestable custom. We have just seen the terrible penalties denounced against cannibalism and against the misuse of fire—always and everywhere the accompaniment of altar sacrifices to all gods.

The Aztecs pushed human sacrifices to a frantic extreme, and as late as the Spanish conquest they were still ritualistic cannibals; that is to say that on certain occasions they ate the flesh of the human victims. Down to the time of the Incas, and even in their time, human sacrifices were practised in Peru, and cannibalism accompanied them at earlier periods. As to its existence in ancient Persia itself, we have Astyages serving up to Harpagus the dead body of his son, and the African expedition of Cambyses eating up every tenth man :<sup>\*</sup> *alimentum habuerint fame sævius*, says Seneca. The Arab Moslem merchant Sulcīman, who wrote his Travels in A.D. 851, says that the Chinese then ate dead bodies “like the idolatrous Magi,” and though this must, so far as the Zoroastrians of the ninth century are concerned, have been a calumny, it was only so in point of time, and was founded on ancient facts for which there is ample evidence in the Avestan prohibitions already quoted. The flesh of all who were killed in battle was then eaten in China, says Suleīman; and Marco Polo reports the same custom among a tribe of Tartars.<sup>†</sup> The Greek mythology has preserved legends and myths that are obviously connected with an epoch at which human sacrifices began to become horrible to slowly softening man. The Semites of Western Asia, the Sivaïte Hindoos, the Celts, and some of the populations of Greece and Italy, continued to sacrifice human beings even long after they are supposed to have renounced cannibalism. At the solar festival of which the originally Eastern Christian Epiphany has taken the place, the pagan Dances sacrificed as many human victims as horses, dogs, and cocks, to the powers of darkness which had hold of the sun; and it is beyond question that the flesh of the whole sacrifice was eaten by the priests and the people.<sup>‡</sup> Snorro Sturleson, in his *Life of Alcuin Athelstan*, says the corpses of the sacrificed men and dogs were suspended in the sacred groves; a great fire was lit in the centre of the temple; over it was hung a cauldron—we almost seem to be reading the *Vendidad* (see p. 36 *ante*), and the flesh was roasted or otherwise prepared. Such feasts are called *blotfagnat* in the Troja Saga. Sturleson gives similar

<sup>\*</sup> Herodotus, i. 119; iii. 25.

<sup>†</sup> Reinaud: “Relation des Voyages,” i. 23, 52; ii. 33.

<sup>‡</sup> Bishop Ditmar *apud* Keysler: “De Interdicto Carnis Equinæ Esu.” Paris, 1868, p. 17.



evidence in his *Life of Olaüs*.\* Govind-Sing, the famous tenth Guru of the Sikhs, who died in 1708, is affirmed to have allowed one of his disciples to be beheaded at the altar of the bloodthirsty goddess Durga. The story is noteworthy, says Professor Monier Williams,† as pointing to the probable prevalence of human sacrifice at that time in Upper India.

To combat human sacrifices and cannibalism, then—and in discussing this unpleasant subject it must not be forgotten that where cannibalism still reigns, human flesh is regarded as the most delicious of all meats—Zoroastrianism worked with and upon the universal human horror of human death, and also upon that innate desire for purity which we find interwoven with all the religions of the earth, whether civilized or savage, from the Japanese Shintô rites of purification round the globe to the English Salvationist's "conviction of sin." The chief means by which uncleanness enters man was ruled to be death, which is the triumph of the evil principle. As soon as the soul has parted from the body, the drughsh Nasu, or female corpse-demon, rushes into the body from the regions of the north—that is, from the regions of darkness, where the sun is swallowed up in winter—from hell, in the shape of a raging fly with knees and tail sticking out, all stained with stains, and like unto the foulest creations of Ahriman (*Vend. vii. 2*). Whoever thenceforth touched the corpse became unclean, and made unclean whomsoever else he touched. The fiend is, as we have seen, expelled by the sag-did, the dog-gaze, which sends the drughsh back to hell. Still, inconsistently enough, the corpse pollutes the living even after this expulsion of the death-demon, and cleansing is to be obtained only by ceremonial washing in gomez and in water, combined with prayers and the sag-did. Another point which tells in favour of the human sacrifice and cannibal origin of the Parsee funeral observances is that the prohibition of the burning of the dead was in force long before interment had ceased. Cambyses, it is true, had roused the indignation of the Persians by burning the body of Amasis in Egypt; but in the time of Herodotus the Persians—presumably the laymen—still coated their dead with wax and buried them, although their priests the Magi had already adopted the exposure to birds and beasts which afterwards became general, for we find that in the time of the Sassanians the prime minister Seoses paid with his life for infringing the law against interment: the priesthood had gained the upper hand. The object was to isolate the corpse as much as possible, to withdraw it far from the sight and thought of man; there-

\* Bishop Ditmar *apud* Keysler: "*De Interdicto Carnis Equinæ Esu*," p. 18, 40.

† "*Religious Life and Thought in India*," p. 166.

fore it was to be, immediately after death, carried to the summit of a mountain—the dakhmas have always been built upon heights—at a distance from water, in order that it might not pollute it; from trees, from fire, and from the world of the living.\*

---

The country of Zoroaster has exercised an influence of the first order on the religious development of Western Asia and of Europe. It is in the sacred writings of the ancient Persians that the struggle of the two world-famous principles of good and evil are most forcibly expounded, and it is thence that later religions have borrowed their diluted beliefs upon this eternal subject, with its attendant hosts of angels and of demons. When what we still call Christianity was in its cradle, Persian influence showed itself in the evolution of numerous sects and heresies: it is only necessary to mention the Gnostics and the Manichæans. Christian doctrines still preserve and exhibit its inefaceable traces. It lent much to the Rabbis and much to Mahommed; to the Gospels, the Talmud, and the Koran. Even in their forced conversion to Islam, in the seventh century and onwards, these Iranians conferred upon that victorious faith a new form, the Shiïte; thus violating the unity of Mahommedanism which is almost exclusively Sunnite everywhere else. And a strange fact it is that the Persian cult, which thus exercised so potent an influence outside itself, has now scarcely an adherent left within its own land, and claims allegiance but from one notable community—the Parsees of British India. Its most flourishing period was the thousand years from the reign of Gushtasp to the conquest of Persia by Alexander. In the two veritable cataclysms that overtook their empire—the conquest of “Iskander the Rumi” in 330 B.C., and that of Caliph Omar in the seventh century of our era—the greater part of their sacred books and records were irremediably destroyed, and the Church disappeared with the State.

We could not expect (says Mr. Dosabhai) after the revolutions, persecutions, and oppressions to which the small body who may claim to be the descendants of the ancient Persians have been subjected, that they should to-day possess any of their religious books, or be well-informed respecting the tenets of their religion (“*Hist. Parsis*,” i. 59).

References were at various times made by the Parsees of India

\* The contraction of impurity by contact with a corpse is also prominent in Brahmanism, but it never was carried so far anywhere as in Zoroastrianism (Monier Williams: “*Religious Thought and Life in India*,” pp. 288, 306).

to their co-religionists in Persia for guidance or information, but "instead of being in a position to impart knowledge, the Zoroastrians of the fatherland needed advice and instruction from those in India." We need not wonder, therefore, to be informed that the hereditary begging fraternity of their priesthood is profoundly ignorant of the first principles of their religion ("Hist. Parsis," i. 233 ; ii. 237) ; and instances are not wanting of their corruptness (i. 169, 221). Mr. Dosabhai is thus forced to lean for his Zoroastrian theology and philosophy chiefly upon Western scholars, quoting largely from Haug, Anquetil du Perron, or Max Müller.

It is not proposed here to write of the sacred books in detail, or to discuss the date of Zoroaster ; subjects which demand unlimited space. We shall rather endeavour to explain what the chief tenets of Zoroastrianism—its dualism and its fire-reverence—have now become ; to contrast the stages of its development in its earlier and its flourishing periods, and to draw parallels where we can from the other beliefs of mankind.

In the first place, then, we must agree with Mr. Dosabhai and Dr. Haug, that the Parsees are now quite as monotheistical as the modern Christians. Whatever may be stated in the remnant of their sacred writings as to past beliefs, their one supreme deity now is Ahura Mazda, shortened into Ormazd, the "all-knowing Lord ;" and their views of Angra Mainyu, corrupted into Ahriman, the "evil spirit," seem to differ in no respect from what is supposed to be the orthodox view of the Christian devil. Two centuries back, Mandelslo wrote of Parseism as a monotheistic faith, but it is equally clear that Magism—so to call it for convenience sake—originally took up and emphasized the two general ideas which were at the bottom of all Indo-Iranian religion—first that there is a Law in nature, and secondly that there is a War in nature. Thus the world as we see it is twofold, being the work of two hostile beings : Ormazd, regarded as Spenta Mainyu, the "good spirit" or principle, and Ahriman, or Angra Mainyu, the evil principle. All that is good in the world comes from the one ; all that is bad from the other. The account of creation and the history of the world are merely the record of the conflict of these two principles ; how Ahriman invaded and marred the world of Ormazd, and how he will be expelled from it at last. Man is active in the conflict, his duty in it being laid before him in the law revealed by Ormazd to Zarathustra, whom we call Zoroaster. When the appointed time is come, a son of Zoroaster, a Messiah, a Saviour, will appear ; Ahriman and hell will be destroyed—Ahriman is therefore not co-eternal with Ormazd, which clearly makes for

monotheism—there will be a general resurrection, and everlasting happiness will reign: Ormazd's kingdom will have come. All these legends are only too familiar to us in other forms—what we are not sufficiently familiar with, unfortunately, are the facts of their origin and their evolution.

The power acknowledged by the progenitors of both Indians and Iranians as establishing the Law in nature was the Heaven-god, and he was the greatest of gods or powers, since there was nothing above nor outside the heavens. He made everything, since everything is produced or takes place in the heavens, in him; he was all-knowing, since the sun, moon, and stars of the heavens see and therefore know all. It is the Tien or Heaven of the Chinese classics, which contains the all-seeing eye of freemasonry. This God was named either, after his nature, Varana, the "all-embracing sky," the Varuna of the Vedic age—whence the *Ὀὐρανός* of the Greeks; or, after his spiritual attributes, Asura, the "Lord," Asura Visvadevas, the "all-knowing Lord," Asura Mazda, the "Lord of Knowledge." This Indo-Iranian Asura is called in the Iranian Avesta, Ahura-Mazda, the "all-knowing Lord;" while the more material term Varana, losing in importance like a cadent organ in comparative anatomy, becomes Varena, the atmosphere. In the time of Herodotus, the Persians, while invoking Auramazda as the creator of earth and heaven, still called the whole sphere of the heavens the supreme God, the father of all Gods; whom Herodotus here calls by the name of his Greek counterpart *Ζεύς* (i. 131).

On the other hand, Ahriman, as the antagonist of Ormazd, is modelled after him, and is partly as it were a negative projection of the supreme good god. Ormazd is all light, truth, goodness and knowledge; Ahriman is all darkness, falsehood, wickedness, and ignorance; just as in Egypt, Osiris was light, and Typhon the darkness; and as in the Apocalypse the world is represented as the scene of the conflict between the kingdom of light made by Christ and the kingdom of darkness ruled by Satan. St. Augustine puzzles his intellect in an amusing manner over the Manichæan view of this war of God with the *gens tenebrarum* ("Confessions," vii. 2), which conflict Cædmon the Saxon used for sacred literary purposes in the "Harrowing of Hell" and other poems, a thousand years before Milton wrote "Paradise Lost." \* Whatever the good spirit makes, the evil

\* All the myths prove that this war in heaven between light and darkness is of solar origin; a fact which will ere long be among those which "every schoolboy knows." It embraced even the contest between sunshine and the storm-clouds, a truth which Turner grasped in his fine storm-landscape

spirit mars. At the creation, \* Ahriman opposed every production of Ormazd with a plague of his own ; mixed poison with plants, smoke with fire, sin with man, and death with life. He is the author of all evil. Therefore it is a religious duty, and one of the thirteen good actions rewarded in the Parsee heaven, to pursue and kill the noxious animals created by Ahriman, such as cats, tortoises, frogs, snakes, lizards, toads, rats, mice, and corn-carrying ants.† These two causes are now looked upon by the Parsees as working under one almighty being ; in fact as inherent in his own nature : an ostrich-like endeavour to escape from dualism which only alters the situation without making it any the more comprehensible. It is like St. Augustine's paradox about the wicked : "The whole of which they form a part is perfect, although they themselves are deformed." *Ecce pulchra sunt cum eis omnia, et ipsi turpes sunt.*—"Confessions," v. 2. ‡

There is literally no end to the illustrations of the dualistic conception of the universe which may be gathered from all the nations of the earth. The worship of the *linga* and *yonis* in India is merely a proof of the strong root-hold which the ancient dualistic philosophy has on the Hindoo mind :

The theory rests on the doctrine of two distinct eternally existing essences : Spirit, regarded as a male principle, and Matter or the germ of the external world, regarded as female. Without the union of the two no creation takes place. At first the sky—*Dyaus*, *Zeus*—

"Apollo slaying the Python." Besides Phœbus and the Python, we have Indra and Vritra in Hindooism ; Bodhisatwa and the black demon Mara in Buddhism ; Œdipus and the Sphinx ; Achilles and Paris ; Sigurd and the dragon Fafnir in Scandinavian fable ; and of course the celebrated expedition of Michael and his angels going forth against the dragon, the old serpent, he that is called Devil and Satan, in the twelfth chapter of the Apocalypse. It is not too much to say that the literature of the world would have been without Goethe's "Faust," had it not been for the influence of Parsee dualism, first on Jewish and then on Christian thought.

\* According to Zoroastrians, creation was continued for 365 days in six unequal intervals. Here, it may be remarked, we have the sun effecting his annual work in six seasons. At the end of each of these intervals was a period of rest.

† The serpent was evil in Egypt, and the crocodile and hippopotamus were sacred to the evil Typhon. To this day killing a devil's coach-horse (*Ocyrops olens*) in the south of Ireland with the thumb-nail, without being stung by the filthy black insect—which can't sting—frees from "the seven deadly sins." In 1120 the Bishop of Laon launched an excommunication against the caterpillars and field-mice which were ravaging the crops ; and as late as 1516 the ecclesiastical court of Troyes admonished the caterpillars to disappear in six days, and in default declared them anathema.

‡ St. Augustine is here cited, as having been a Manichæan from the nineteenth to the twenty-eighth year of his age.

bending over all was personified as a heavenly Father—Dyauspitar, Jupiter—and the earth as the Mother of all creatures. \*

In the totally independent primitive faith of Japan the same conception is found in Hiko and Hime, the sun-male and sun-female; *hi* meaning sun or fire. But there is a departure in this from Chinese mythology, in which the sun-deity is a god—just as our own word sun is still masculine.† Chinese cosmogony starts with a homogeneous globe like an egg, emblematic perhaps of our primeval chaos. This one eternal principle became dual, and divided itself into *yin* and *yang*, or a *vis inertia* and a *vis mobile*; the one dark, inferior, passive, weak, feminine; while to the other, the *vis mobile*, are attributed light, activity, strength, and masculinity. It is in fact, like the Hindoo philosophy, a projection outwards into the universe of the sexhood of man and of the animate creation. These male and female principles are also called by the Chinese positive and negative essences. Thus the sun of day is positive, and the moon of night negative. So, too, the male principle is called right and the female left. The Manichæans—and it must not be forgotten that their founder had lived long among the Persian Magi—went so far in the same direction as to say that Eve was created by the demons, and they held that there were two souls in man, one tending to good and the other to evil. This appears in the Zoroastrian speculative philosophy as the two intellects of man: ‡ born wisdom, innate in man, which is heavenly and divine; and acquired wisdom, which is liable to err. This born wisdom is nothing but the innate, natural, original conscience of the Chinese philosopher Mencius, the true arbiter of the “righteousness” to which we are ever struggling to adhere. Minor instances of the ever-present under-current of this dualism are incessant in Judaism and Christianity: such are the conjuring contests between Moses and Aaron and the Egyptian magicians (Exodus iv. *seq.*), the rivalry of the Apostles and Simon Magus, and the antagonism set up by Christians and pagans between Apollonius of Tyana and Jesus of Nazareth.

Enough has been said to illustrate the dual creed of Zoroas-

\* Monier Williams: “Religious Life and Thought in India,” i. 223, 224.

† The sun is spoken of as “she” in the Eddas (Mallet’s “Northern Antiquities,” 1847, p. 407).

‡ Nineteenth-century science has reached a not dissimilar conclusion. See Dr. A. L. Wigan’s “The Duality of the Mind;” and “Our Two Brains,” by Mr. R. A. Proctor, in *Knowledge*, vol. vi. p. 189. The common idiom of all languages, “I said to myself,” “Je me suis dit,” and so on, daily tells us the same thing unobserved.

trianism in the past, and to show that, as regards the present, it does not much diverge from what is called monotheism in Christianity. The other leading characteristic of the Parsee religion is its reverence for fire.

But this reverence for fire does not stand alone. The holiness of water and earth as well is pushed to an extreme scrupulosity. During the Indo-Iranian period, before Magism and Hindooism diverged on separate lines of religious development, these elements were already considered sacred, and in the Vedas they are worshipped as god-like beings. In the Shah-Namah, Firdusi, the faithful preserver of ancient Aryan traditions, assigns the origin of fire-worship to Haoshyangha, successor of Gayomardh or Gaya Maretan the first man and first king of the world, according to the Zoroastrian myths. Hymns addressed to Agni, fire, take precedence of all others in nine of the ten divisions of the Rig-Veda. Yet this did not prevent the Indian from burning his dead, whom the fire benignly wafted to the heavenly abodes "on his undecaying, flying pinions, wherewith he slew the demons." Fire, as in sacrifices, was the entity, the God, that not alone comes from heaven to earth but goes from earth to heaven; the communicator, the mediator between God and man; the deity most friendly to man. But among the Iranians the original reverence for fire took another path. The element remains more unapproachable by man, and is the purest part here below of the pure creation of the good spirit; the earthly form of the eternal, infinite, godly light; the weapon and the son of Ormazd, of God.\* The perfume of fire is pleasant to the maker Ormazd,† a fundamental assumption in the burnt offerings of all religions. Another of its functions is to repel the fiends with its bright blazing. Wherever Parsees are settled an everlasting fire, the Bahram fire, is kept up with a more than vestal care, and ever fed with dry, well-burning wood and perfumes; kings have even fed it with pearls; no uncleanness, no death, must enter it. On whichever side the wind blows its flames they go forth and kill myriads of unseen demons, for it is one of the most powerful and dreaded opponents of Ahriman. Bahram, the genius of victory, was originally Verethragna, and has his parallel and namesake in the Vedic Indra Vritrahan, Indra the fiend-smiter. In the Mazdean cosmology, too, the world is to end by fire; a crude idea, diametrically opposed to astronomy and geology, and still but too familiar to pious Christian childhood. The element is called "the most rejoicing fire, the beneficent and assembly-making" (round the hearth and at the

---

\* Vendidad, xviii. 193, and a hundred other texts. † Vishtasp Yasht, 51.

altar).\* Marriages in India take place before a fire whereon incense is burnt, and in Persia the Parsee bride and bridegroom walk thrice round a blazing fire. When fire was taken for cooking, or for the oven of the potter, by a transparent fiction it was not defiled if restored after use and unextinguished to its right place, the altar of perpetual fire. Quenching it is a deadly sin, even blowing it with the breath is a crime : it must be fanned ; and for that reason no orthodox Parsee can smoke either tobacco or opium. Water cannot, because of the incompatibility of the two sacred elements, be employed for putting out a conflagration, though it may be smothered out with earth and stones. A Parsee cannot be a smith, for he would have to plunge hot iron into water, nor can he belong to any craft which pollutes or puts out fire. It is a disrespect to the fire to allow its lustre to be dimmed by exposure to the sun's rays. Here we have the origin of the widely spread popular notion that the sun shining on a fire puts it out. A Parsee of the present day, when praying, is directed to stand before the fire, or turn his face to the sun. His fire-temples are open day and night for private prayer, and on special festivals, such as New-Year's Day, the seventeenth day of the second month, and the ninth of the ninth, they are crowded with worshippers bearing offerings of sandal-wood.

Fire is held by a Parsee to be the truest emblem of the refulgence and glory of God. He looks upon fire as the most perfect symbol of the deity on account of its purity, brightness, activity, subtlety, fecundity, and incorruptibility. Besides, it is the most useful and excellent of God's creatures. The numberless blessings which in all its different forms, it bestows upon the earth, justify man in paying his respect to this noblest creation ("Hist. Parsis," ii. 211).

The sacred fire in the temples is now held not to be the ordinary hearth-fire, for it has been nine times purified. When a temple is established fire is brought from several different places, and kept in as many separate braziers. Efforts are made to obtain fire from lightning—"ignem cœlitus delapsum" †—and one of the temples in Bombay was thus kindled. A tree near Calcutta having been fired by lightning, a brand was taken from it, and the fire thus obtained was carried across India, being fed with sandal-wood along the road, by the piety

\* Fravardin Yasht, 85.

† Ammianus Marcellinus, xxvii. 6. Henry Lord reported that in the seventeenth century there were seven sources for these fires : from flint and steel, from wood-friction, from lightning, from will-o'-the-wisps (!), from the hearth, from Hindoo cremation fires (but this may well be doubted), and from the burning-glass (chap. viii.).



of the Parsees. Apam Napadh, the tall Lord, the fire of lightning, the Vedic Apam Napat, is invoked in the Avesta.\* In Persia the first fire in a temple is ignited by means of a burning lens.† The purification of the new temple-fire is thus managed : Above one of the many braziers a perforated fire-shovel containing chips and dust of sandal-wood‡ is held until the contents are aflame; from this again another fire is procured in the same way, and the process is repeated nine times, when the fire is pronounced pure. The same operation is now gone through with each of the other braziers, and at length all the "purified" fires are concentrated in one sole brazier on a lofty pedestal, which is placed in the *sagri* or sacred sanctuary of the temple.

Though the educated Parsee discriminates between God and the fire, there is perhaps but little doubt that the vulgar and illiterate of the present day worship the sacred flame, as well as the sun, moon, and stars. Indeed, Mr. Dosabhai quotes without comment a passage from Forbes's "Oriental Memoirs" which asserts this. And as for the past, the Avesta bristles with passages to prove actual fervent worship of the fire and its spirit. The whole of the Atash Niyayish,§ for example, is an impassioned prayer and hallelujah to the beneficent element. It is to be recited when in presence of fire, and the following is a summary of it :—

Hail unto thee, O Fire, son of Ormazd : Thou beneficent and most great. . . . The glory of the Aryas . . . the beneficent, the warrior, the god who is a full source of glory and of healing. Thou art worthy of sacrifice and invocation. Mayest thou have the right wood, incense, and food. \*Mayest thou ever burn, blaze, and increase in this house, even till the good, powerful, restoration of the world. Give me, O Fire, son of Ormazd, fulness of living welfare, maintenance, and life; knowledge, sagacity, quickness of tongue, holiness of soul, good memory and the understanding that ever grows, and is not acquired through learning. Give me, however unworthy, a seat in the bright, all-happy, blissful abode of the holy ones.

We gladden thy mighty Fire, O Ormazd, thy fleet and powerful Fire, who shows his assistance [in the ordeal] to those who have ever comforted him, but delights in vengeance on those who have harmed him.||

\* Sirozah, i. 7. † H. Petermann: "Reisen in Orient."

‡ "Many snakes like to establish themselves in the roots of trees, especially in those of the sandal-wood tree. The connection of serpent-worship with tree-worship may have originally arisen from this fact." (Monier Williams: "Religious Thought and Life in India," i. 331).

§ "Sacred Books of the East," xxiii. 357.

'Vengeance is mine,' saith the Lord (Romans xii. 19).

After this we can scarcely blame the uninitiated for their misapprehension of Zoroastrians—the Moslem especially, who habitually, as in the “Arabian Nights” (Lane, i. 197), accuses the Magians of “worshipping fire in the place of the Almighty King.” And we have no knowledge of any religion that has failed to pay its share of reverence to Sun and to Fire; the one the earthly manifestation, the Son, of the other. From the farthest East to the remotest West, among all branches of the human family, these two cults—which are in essence but one—have been fundamental in all religions. Ormazd said in revelation to Zoroaster, “my light is concealed under all that shines.” Let the Roman Christian Bishop of Bombay speak of the “convenient and delightful creature,” fire:—

Shining flames and burning fires are used as emblems of God's majesty and presence in the most important circumstances of the Jewish religion—in the vocation of Moses, the deliverance from Egyptian bondage, the guidance through the desert, the proclamation of the Commandments, the ark of the covenant, the first sacrifice. And the same emblems are used also for the same purpose in the Christian Church. . . . In the sanctuaries of the Parsee temple and of the [Roman] Christian church we see a perpetual flame indicating the presence of God. I am unable to express the deep and vehement feelings which move my heart when I kneel in my chapel and think of the Parsee temple a few yards off, in which a fire is ever burning like the flame in our sanctuary lamp (Meurin's “Zoroaster and Christ”).

We proceed to give in the briefest manner a few of the facts which may be gleaned outside Parseeism as to fire-worship. About the beginning of our era the Kanarkis, the Scythian rulers of the Punjab, would seem, if the fire-altar on their coins can be trusted, to have adopted the Zoroastrian faith. Japanese Shintôism asserts that blood and fire are essentially identical, being both connected with heat; and according to the Rig-Veda the Supreme Being developed the whole order of existing entities through the operation of heat. One verse says “all gods are comprehended in fire” (v. 3. 1); and another, “he surrounds them all, as the rim of a wheel does the spokes.” Fire was thus to a Hindoo the visible embodiment, not only of heat, but of all the other forces of nature. He saw it not alone on earth but in the sky as lightning, and in the heavens as the sun. The sun was inaccessible, and not always visible, while fire could always be maintained or, if extinguished, could be relighted. He had a room or sanctuary for sacrifices on the ground-floor of his house. There the fire—quite apart from the domestic hearth—was kept in three differently shaped

receptacles, the fire in each having a different name. It was a triune symbol of God present in the house; a "brilliant guest" that sojourned in the midst of the family (Rig-Veda, x. 91, 2); a divine mediator that bore the savour of the daily offerings to heaven; a living link between man and the denizens of the air and sky. The Hindoo newly married pair in ancient times brought to their new house a portion of the sacred fire before which they were united; and this once kindled was ever afterwards kept up for domestic or sacrificial uses, and eventually for their own cremation. But the ancient fire-worship has almost disappeared from India, except among Brahmans of the old school at Benares and some others of their strongholds. Still, when a young Brahman is tonsured he is to this day placed so that he has the sacred fire to the East, whence comes the sun of which it is a type; one of the six daily duties of the Svami Narayana sect, too, is making offerings to fire.\* The waving of lighted lamps before a Hindoo preacher is paralleled by the swinging of the thurible before Roman Christian priests; and in the use of the thurible the fire is the essential part, the incense being merely the perfume from time immemorial burnt on the sacred fire. Khanikoff, in his "*Memoires sur l'Ethnographie de la Perse*," testifies that at the present day in Khorassan, when the Mahometan villagers go out to meet a stranger, they carry a brazier of burning charcoal. Fire was carried on silver altars before the army of Darius.

Among the Assyrians and Babylonians the month of Abu (July-August), the fiercest of summer, was sacred to the descent of the God Fire—the Phœnician Chousor, the Greek Hephaistos, Vulcan. The Parsee priests are the successors of the Athravans or "fire-men" of their Avesta—the *πύραιοι* or Magi of Strabo (xv. 733), the Atharvans of the Vedas; and Kühn, in his "*Herabkunft des Feuers*," has established a link between the Hindoo Pramantha and the Greek Prometheus. In Gehenna, the valley of the sons of Hinnom, was the temple called Tophet, where the Jews passed their children through the fire, or even burned them in honour of Moloch the god of the Ammonites. Among the Teutonic nations fires were lighted at mid-summer on the tops of hills, in honour of the wending sun. In Rhodes, at the same solstice—now John the Baptist's eve—all who pass a bonfire have to jump through it. "I indeed baptize you with water, but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire," said the Baptist (Matt. iii. 11; Luke iii. 16); and the Abyssinians, taking this literally, apply a hot iron to the forehead. The Roman baptism of fire was

---

\* Monier Williams: "Religious Life and Thought in India."

by jumping thrice through the flames of a sacred fire, and this is still practised in India. In some parts of Scotland children at baptism are swung over a fire three times; and the pagan Danes passed their wine-cups through the sacrificial fire. What is now the Christmas log once kept up the fire all night during the sun's longest absence, in the winter solstice or sun-stay.

In every Mexican house the first libation and the first morsel of food were consecrated to the fire-god, and the contaminated household fire was extinguished once a year, and renewed in its purity by wood-friction before the statue of the same fire-god. The god of fire, Hi-Musubi, fire-producer, is worshipped in Japanese Shintô, and once a year on his day fire is obtained by the friction of wood, and the fire to cook offerings in the temple of the sun-goddess is also thus lit. The god of fire hates impurity, and food cooked with unclean fire defiled one of the earliest goddesses of Japan. The ashes of the Bahram fire are used by the Parsees for ritualistic purifications. The Brahman rubs his body with ashes from his sacred domestic fire, and the ashes with which the foreheads of pious Roman Christians are marked by the priests on Ash Wednesday are indubitably a survival of ancient fire-worship. The ordeal by fire, which is found from India to the Congo, had its origin in the divine nature of the element which would discriminate and abstain from injuring the innocent.

The discovery of fire upon the earth must, like the origin of the wheel, ever remain enveloped in the darkness of the primeval past. One well-known theory is that stones, having been, with sticks, the first weapons of savage man, stone had to be worked, and that it was in working hard stones or flints that fire was first obtained. But this does not explain the origin of wood-friction. And then volcanoes and other subterranean fires—which were much more numerous and active in pre-historic times—and ignition by lightning, or by the sun's rays in hot latitudes, brought about by the adventitious action of lens-like masses of the atmosphere formed by air-currents, and spontaneous combustion; all these would have familiarized primitive man with fire, and thus from time to time certain tribes could have precariously obtained it. There is one speculation which is sufficiently interesting, namely, that the intelligent discoverers of the mode of producing fire from stones need not have been men at all, even in the geological and palæontological sense of the word man, but may have been his precursors in the scale of evolution—the man-apes.

Fire and its flame have always been mysterious to man. To tell ourselves that fire is luminous combustion (which comes

from the root *us*, to burn), and to go on to explain that combustion is the combination of a mass of matter with oxygen, and that that combination is accompanied by a disengagement of heat which often becomes luminous, and that we then call it fire, is little else than travelling in a circle. And to add that flame is a gas in a state of combustion is not much more than mere paraphrase. A modern man of science has even fallen back upon the bald old statement that flame is matter passing from one phase to another. We got a little further towards a final cause when we discovered that heat is a mode of motion and can be converted directly into electricity; and the modern chemist's present way of stating it is that in combustion we have a loss of chemical energy, balanced by an equivalent production of heat. But all this is rank blasphemy and atheism to the fire-worshipper, at the same time that it leaves us face to face with the unknowable, which is the last word of all theologies as well as of all sciences; the only difference being that theologies at this point invariably assume a lot of wonderful and gratuitous things which science asks to have proved. You may tell a Zoroastrian that the luminous heat which radiates from the sun transforms itself in the sandal-wood tree, as it grows, into chemical energy, and reappears as luminous heat when he casts that sandal-wood on his sacred Balram fire. He can reply: I knew it. Ages ago our hymns told us that "behind Mithra's chariot drives Atar; behind the Sun drives the Genius of Fire, all in a blaze, and the kingly glory."\* If you become more general, and tell the Brahman that the last word of science is that the endless phenomena of nature all come by more or less roundabout ways to a diffusion of energy in the condition of heat, he can say again: I knew it. Ages ago our hymns told us—

From glowing Heat sprang all existing things,  
Yea, all the Order of this Universe.†

When we try to dissect fire-reverence we find that, in addition to the mysterious side of the question, certain practical facts must have united to surround the phenomenon with importance and add to its preciousness. First came the ever-present difficulty of generating it, and then the labour of keeping it when obtained. We, with our modern chemical facilities for obtaining fire, think little of these things, and can scarcely realize them. Familiarity breeds contempt; and it is possible to contemplate that trifling item of the oilman's stores, the lucifer match, as eventually destroying "fire-worship" even in

---

\* *Mihir Yasht*, 127.

† *Rig-Veda*, x. 190.

its last stronghold. The Parsee may one day come to the level of Wordsworth in this respect, his pious aspirations dwindling to a mere material desire

“To sit without emotion, hope, or aim,  
In the loved presence of his cottage-fire,  
And listen to the flapping of the flame,  
Or kettle whispering its faint undersong.”

\*\*\*\*\*

### ART. III.—THE MANCHESTER SHIP CANAL.

A BILL for the incorporation of a company, and for the construction of a Ship Canal from Manchester to the deep water in the estuary of the River Mersey, has passed through the House of Lords, and will shortly have to be considered by the House of Commons. There are many matters connected with the promotion of this Bill which require careful consideration. The fact that Manchester has persisted in three successive Sessions in asking Parliament to sanction such a scheme, that very large sums of money have been spent hitherto unsuccessfully in prosecuting this measure, is of itself not without significance. But it is even a more significant fact that such communities as Manchester, Salford and Warrington have voluntarily taxed themselves twopence in the pound, or a total amount of about £25,000, for the purpose of promoting this measure. Beyond doubt South Lancashire is in earnest in this matter, and that earnestness points to a deep-rooted conviction upon the part of these great industrial communities, that they are at the present time under some serious disability from which the construction of this Canal may be the means of rescuing them. It may be worth while to inquire into the causes which have led to this vigorous movement in South Lancashire, and to describe some of the features of the project which Parliament has been so pertinaciously asked to sanction.

One thing is very certain, painfully certain—and that is, that at the present time there is a very serious depression of trade in this country. It is not only true that the ships of our mercantile navy can find very little to do, that in the East-coast ports hundreds of ships are “laid up,” but in almost every branch of domestic industry there is a flatness and depression which seriously affects both the capital and labour which has been wont to flow in these industrial directions. The great industries of South Lancashire and West Yorkshire have not been left un-

touched by the blight which has fallen upon the other trades of this country. The cotton trade has suffered seriously. It is not necessary to refer to the convincing evidence of this fact which was laid before the Committee of the House of Lords ; to any one who inquires into the present condition of that important trade there is enough of evidence to compel them to believe in the deplorable and widespread depression which exists in that hitherto very flourishing industry.\*

That this depression is to some extent to be accounted for by the "fiscal perversity" of foreign nations is no doubt true, but that it is to a larger extent to be accounted for by the increased activity of foreign competition seems certain. Not so long ago Britain had no rival in the cotton trade, but now year by year the competition between this country and Europe, America, and India is becoming more and more fierce. We can no longer easily hold our own in the markets in which we used formerly to domineer. We are still first in the race, but only by a neck, and every year our competitors are lessening the little distance which still separates us from them. We do not desire to load these pages with figures, and we therefore sum up the plainest inferences from the statistics of trade in these words. It was then under these circumstances that the trade of Lancashire had to consider—what had become a paramount question—the economy of production. The whole principle of free trade is, that the consumer is to be supplied from the best market at the cheapest rate. But the question for the producer under the conditions which free trade imposes, is how to produce an equally good or better article than producers in other places, and to offer it to the consumer at a cheaper rate. It is of course no use for such a producer to make his article at half the cost of his rival, if it costs him more than double to get his goods to the market when they are wanted. In these days, when through the great improvement of the means of communication nearness gives no monopoly as it did in the old days, the cost of carriage is one of the most important matters which producers have to consider. When trade is exceedingly prosperous in a certain district, when a country has a practical monopoly of a certain industry, it is

\* The question of the depression in the cotton trade was dealt with in an article in the *Times* of the 4th of June, 1885. The writer ascribes the depression to over-production, and suggests that the over-production may be accounted for by the operations of the building speculator, by the action of the small employers, or by the competition which has been introduced by the limited companies. But over-production is only another way of saying under-demand. The Manchester Chamber of Commerce have invited Mr. Goschen to address the Chamber on the 16th June, "On the Condition and Prospects of the Trade."

curious to see how many parasitic trades spring up in connection with it. When the profits of the producers are large, they do not trouble to rid themselves of the various middle-men who tax the commodities between themselves and the consumers. It is only when the profits are reduced, when competition is seriously felt, that the producers and consumers alike desire to come face to face, and to dispense with the expensive services of those gentlemen who have been tolerated in more prosperous days. No better illustration of this fact could be found than the existence of lawyers. They are the parasites of a full-blooded trade. But whenever profits become small, whenever the blood of commerce becomes thin, there is distress in Bedford Row and the Temple. In times of commercial frost, lawyers are "frozen out."

So it is with the trade in a great community. For years Lancashire seemed content to bear the heavy taxation to which its trades were subjected. The very high Liverpool Dock dues, made up of various unnecessary charges, like master portorage, quay attendance, and the like, were not complained of. The excessive railway rates charged by the companies for the conveyance of goods between Liverpool and South Lancashire were borne with docility. The existence of a whole class of middle-men, called cotton brokers, without whose intervention, both on the side of the sellers and the buyers, cotton could not change hands, was scarcely regarded as an anomaly, but the depression of trade, the serious competition, has induced the producers to look into these matters, and to inquire whether by any means they can dispense with the services of these expensive satellites. It is now thrust upon the traders in these districts with the force of conviction, that if they are to compete in foreign markets with foreign and colonial producers, they must get their goods to the markets at a cheaper rate. Hence the necessity which has arisen to look into every item of the cost of production. Most of the items which are under the control of the manufacturer have already been reduced to a minimum; but in Lancashire, at least, it seemed that the only further economy which was possible was in relation to transit charges. These still stood like a high wall between our home producer and the foreign consumer. The necessity for reduction of that obstacle, or if reduction was impossible, the necessity for finding a means of avoiding it, has been manifested by more than one proposal made in recent years. The trades of this country were suffering from high transit charges, and they moved Parliament to inquire into the rates charged by railways; they themselves proposed a new method of conveyance, for in 1882 they promoted a Bill to authorize the construction of a Plate Railway, and in the same



year the producers of South Lancashire promoted the first Ship Canal Bill. From that time to the present that project has been constantly before Parliament and the public in one form or another, and should the present Bill be rejected by Parliament, we do not for an instant believe that that will be an end of this troublous matter. The trades of this country will not be ruined without an effort, and if they cannot find a remedy by means of a Ship Canal, they will have to find some other solution of the problem how to compete with their foreign rivals—how to get their goods to the market at a cheaper rate.

The history of this whole movement is exceedingly instructive. In 1881 Parliament appointed a Committee to inquire into the charges of railway companies and canal companies for the conveyance of merchandise, minerals, agricultural produce, and parcels, upon railways and canals; into the laws and other conditions affecting such charges, and into the working of the Railway Commission of 1873, and to report as to any amendment of the laws and practice affecting the said charges and the powers of the commission that may be desirable. This large inquiry was instigated, in the first instance, by persons and traders who were dissatisfied with the charges which were being made by railway companies. But the railway interest is a very strong element in the present House of Commons, and it turned out that the Committee which was at first appointed had on it a larger number of members whose object it would be to maintain or increase railway charges, than of members who would exert themselves to reduce these in the interests of the public. There were murmurs in the House of Commons, and the President of the Board of Trade gave way, and appointed four more members to be members of the Committee, whose leaning would, it was thought, be in favour of the trading and travelling public. That was not a very satisfactory illustration of the modern methods of legislation, or of the preliminaries which lead to Acts of Parliament. The Committee was, of course, composed of two hostile camps, and the witnesses who were in favour of the further regulation of railways were cross-examined by one set of Committee-men; those who were in favour of the legalization of terminal charges, were cross-examined by the other. In the result, there was a report of compromise. It recommended that the railway companies should have further charging powers, and that the Railway Commission should have further regulating powers. So far, the result was far from satisfactory to the traders. To the railway companies, on the other hand, the report was favourable, and the Bill introduced by the President of the Board of Trade, in 1884, which was founded on the report, was accepted by them as on the whole a satisfactory measure.

When that Bill failed, all the great railway companies applied to Parliament, in the present Session, for special Acts authorizing them to charge station-terminals; and in many instances authorizing them to increase their maximum charges. This was a sorry position for the traders who had instigated the inquiry. Instead of securing the reductions they desired, their efforts were likely to lead, it would seem, to an increase of the rates. These proposals, however, were resisted by the trading community with an energy seldom put forth. And in the result, as it is well known, all these Bills, which would certainly have been rejected, were withdrawn. So far, then, nothing has come of the agitation commenced in 1881. The Blue-Books containing the report of that Select Committee are full of complaints of the excessive charges made by railway companies: full of complaints that railway companies carried goods for export at lower rates than for home consumption, and carried imported goods at lower rates than those of the home producer. From no part of the country were complaints more numerous, or apparently better founded, than from Liverpool and South Lancashire. Mr. Forwood, a witness of some position and information, complained grievously of the great disadvantage under which Liverpool carried on its trade, as compared with other ports.\* Beyond all question, the gravamen of the complaint was proved. The railway rates charged in South Lancashire were undoubtedly excessive. It is scarcely necessary to go to the Blue-Book for proof of that fact. The railway companies have themselves admitted it by reducing on January 1, 1884, while the Ship Canal Bill of that year was pending, the rates hitherto charged.

So much then for the attempted remedy of the high transit charges by means of direct Parliamentary intervention.

In the autumn of 1882 certain gentlemen, mainly connected with trade in Liverpool, sought to supply another remedy by the promotion of a Bill for the construction of what was called a Plateway.† In their prospectus they said, "The conveyance on

---

\* Thus he said, in answer to the question, "What is the feeling in Liverpool with reference to railway charges?"—"There has been during the last twenty-five or thirty years a very strong feeling that we are suffering very considerable injury from the excessive railway charges both to and from Liverpool." "In your opinion, what has been the effect of that upon the trade of Liverpool?"—"That a large amount of trade which should properly centre in Liverpool has been devoted to other ports and places," and "I calculate that on the whole we pay an overcharge of £400,000 upon the carriage of the articles I have mentioned."

† This was a railway constructed with the flange upon the rail instead of on the wheel. Ordinary waggons and carts would have been enabled to travel on the plate railway.

the same line of both passengers and goods has increased the cost of the latter in a manner few would expect. The speed demanded by passengers has necessitated lines with easy gradients and curves of large sweep. These have compelled earthworks, tunnels and viaducts of great cost, a permanent way and signalling arrangements of a very expensive and perfect nature. That traffic has also diminished the cargo-carrying power of the line by demanding a considerable interval between the trains, and has caused needless and costly speed to heavy traffic in order to clear the lines. Those causes combined have both narrowed the capacity and increased the cost of carrying goods by rail. . . . The object of the Lancashire Plateway Company is to cheapen and improve the conveyance of goods and minerals in that portion of Lancashire lying mainly between the Ribble and the Mersey. It is not denied that railways and canals are numerous and efficient in the district, but the traffic already occasionally taxes seriously their powers, and is yearly increasing. Moreover, the rates they have combined to charge are so heavy as to have been the subject of long-standing and general dissatisfaction and hitherto unavailing remonstrance." These sentences indicate that the object of these promoters was to remedy the same evils which the promoters of the Ship Canal aimed at, but as the promoters of the Lancashire Plateways scheme did not proceed much further than the deposit of their Bill in Parliament, it does not seem necessary to say more about that abortive proposal.

We come then now to the third remedy which was proposed for these grave evils, and that was the construction of a Ship Canal from Manchester to the sea. This was not by any means a new project. The question of improving the rivers Mersey and Irwell as a means of water communication to Manchester, seems to have been considered over and over again. Some very competent engineers had considered and reported upon the matter, but although clauses had been introduced into various Railway Acts which authorized the construction of lines of railway over these rivers, making it obligatory upon the companies to substitute swing-bridges for permanent fixed bridges whenever it became necessary by reason of the improvement of the river, so as to enable sea-going ships to get to Manchester, nothing was done. Indeed, the rivers, which were now in the hands of the Bridgewater Canal Company, were allowed to go from bad to worse, they were allowed to silt up, so that at present there is very little use made of them as a means of water communication. But now that economy of transit was thrust upon the manufacturers as a necessity, the possibility of improving that water-way again presented itself to their minds.

There can be no question, although the matter has been lost sight of by us in recent years, that water carriage has many advantages over carriage by land. It is of course very much cheaper. Every class of traffic can be carried at its appropriate speed without interfering with other traffic. Goods can be landed or shipped at every point on either side of a canal, instead of only at fixed stations, as in the case of a railway. The land on either side becomes more valuable by reason of the facilities it enjoys in connection with the water-way. Vessels would be enabled to get nearer the ultimate destination of their cargoes. There would be a great saving in handling of goods in transshipping, in carting and other services, and the possibility of vessels reaching a great centre of industry without breaking bulk was one of the advantages which commended itself to the promoters of the project. These then were some of the considerations which led to the promotion of this very important scheme. Lancashire was thoroughly in earnest about the matter. Indeed, no proposal has been more enthusiastically received in that district than this, which had for its object the making of Manchester a port. It is not, however, only in that part of the country that the project is watched with interest. It is no secret that Leeds has thoughts of reaching the sea through the Humber, and only two Sessions ago the Corporation opposed the Hull and Lincoln Railway Bill in Parliament, on the ground that if it was sanctioned, the bridge to be constructed over the Humber, a mile or two above Hull, would be an obstruction in case of a Ship Canal for Leeds being promoted. But it is not only in the Midlands that water-ways are looked upon with favour. Should the Ship Canal be sanctioned, we have reason to believe that we may, before long, hear of a Ship Canal from the Tyne to the Solway, and the feasibility of making a pathway for ships between the Firths of Forth and Clyde has long been thought of as a possibility.

It was in the end of 1882 that the first of the recent proposals to construct a Ship Canal to Manchester was put into shape. It was then that the first Bill was introduced into Parliament. It was, as we said, a part of the outcome of the movement to cheapen transit as a means of economizing the total cost of production. The fact that the trade of South Lancashire was seriously taxed between the ship and the loom, and again between the loom and the purchaser, was not disputed. Liverpool was never tired of complaining of the enormous railway rates it was compelled to pay, and the railway companies retaliated in words upon Liverpool, by asserting, and with truth, that Liverpool was, with the exception of London, the largest port in the United Kingdom. Unquestionably the assertion of

Liverpool and the *tu quoque* of the railway companies were both true. No one cares now to dispute that the rates charged by the various carrying companies to and from the manufactory and the ship's side, are exceedingly high as compared with rates charged in other parts of the country. It is not denied, but it is excused or explained on the ground that in Liverpool and Manchester the railway companies have spent an enormous amount of money, probably not less than £3,000,000, in providing station and other terminal accommodation, and that the rates must be adjusted so as to pay an interest upon that expenditure. In reference to that explanation we may have something to say hereafter. Here we only desire to note the fact that the railway rates are admittedly high, and that the highness of these rates was one of the main reasons for promoting the Manchester Ship Canal. But it is also past dispute that Liverpool is an exceedingly dear port. That fact may be accounted for in various ways. It is said that with the view of preventing the competition of Birkenhead, the Mersey Dock Board purchased the Birkenhead Dock for a very large sum of money, some £1,300,000, if we remember aright, and that upon that unremunerative expenditure the Board has to pay interest, and that the dues are consequently higher than they would otherwise be. There is, too, a very complicated history connected with the Liverpool town dues. It seems that these dues ought to have been paid off, but that although the money was raised for the purpose, it was applied to some other object, and that as a fact the dues are still charged. But it is a matter of indifference to the trade how the highness of the Dock dues is to be accounted for—the fact is, that they have to be paid. The Mersey Dock and Harbour Board have to pay interest upon some £16,000,000, and the dues that they have to charge must be in proportion to their indebtedness. That they are high, is a fact of comparison. That they are too high for the trade, is not only evidenced by the fact that the trade complains, but by the extraordinary success of the cheaper port of Garston, which is further up the estuary, and which in the hands of the London and North-Western Railway Company does a very large and a rapidly increasing trade.

These, then, were the two main facts upon which the promoters of the scheme relied—that the railway rates were excessive, and that the dock dues were high. At first there seemed to be an impression that both the railway companies and the Dock Board were charging more than they ought to charge. The fact already alluded to, that since the promotion of the Ship Canal Bill the railway companies have reduced their rates, would seem to show that that belief was well-founded. But

beyond the mere excess which could at the will of the companies be abated, there was a conviction that any reduction which would be really a substantial relief to the trade, could not as a fact be made either by the railway companies or by the Dock Board. In recent contests, consequently, the attitude of the traders has been somewhat modified. They say, "We do not blame the Mersey Dock and Harbour Board, it may be necessary for them to charge these dues at Liverpool. We do not complain of the railway charges, the companies may, as they say, have expended enormous sums in providing station accommodation in Liverpool and Manchester. And one way or another, no doubt, they must make rates, which will pay them for that expenditure. What we say is, that however justifiable these rates and dues may be, we cannot afford to pay them. If the trade is to continue with us—if we are to continue in the trade, we must, in order to compete with our rivals, have lower transit charges. And as we cannot get these at Liverpool or on the railways, we have promoted this Ship Canal, which will be a cheaper means of transit, which will enable us to get our goods to and from the sea at something like half the present charges, and will thus enable us to meet foreign competition."\* Now there can be no question that there is a great deal in this argument. Why, it may well be asked, should not these persons who are interested in the trade of South Lancashire, make a canal for themselves? That it may compete with the existing means of carriage, is no argument against it. The railways competed with and drove the old carriers off the road. Parliament in sanctioning railways gave the companies no monopoly of trade, and implied no guarantee that they were to be protected in the quiet enjoyment of any trade they might secure. Railway companies were companies of adventurers, and have no right to complain of competition. Nay, further, they ought to have anticipated competition, and competition of the same nature as that which will be introduced by the construction of the Ship Canal. The whole course of legislation in the last half-century has been to encourage competition between canals and railways. The Report of the Joint Select Committee on Amalgamation of 1872, stated that "there is some competition between railways and canals, and it is desirable to make every effort to keep up and develop the system of inland water navigation, although it is improbable that that system can maintain a general or powerful competition with railways." But not only

---

\* The maximum charges which are authorized to be made under the Ship Canal Bill are equal to half the existing dock dues and railway rates taken together. But of course it does not follow that the company will charge their maximum rates.

in 1872, but as we said during the last half-century, Parliament has been endeavouring to develop and strengthen the competition between these two means of communication. In 1845, with this view it passed an Act of Parliament to empower canal companies and the commissioners of navigable rivers to vary their tolls, rates, and charges on different parts of their navigation; and in the same year, and in 1847, Acts were passed to enable canal companies to become the carriers of goods upon their canals.\* That there was wisdom in this policy, had it been acted upon in time, few will doubt. Although the Legislature had conferred no monopoly upon railway companies, it was found that they were creating a practical monopoly for themselves. They were combining with one another, and were becoming a great power in the State—so great a power, indeed, that one well-known authority had said, “If the State will not manage the railways, the railways will manage the State.” But the management, or “regulation,” to use the statutory word, of railways, was a matter of very great difficulty—of such difficulty, indeed, that up to the present time, although Parliament has been trying her “prentice hand” at the regulation of railways for the last thirty years, it has not yet found out any excellent method of doing so. It tried and abandoned Lord Dalhousie’s Commission. It tried and abandoned the courts of law; and it is now, at considerable cost and without producing much satisfaction, experimenting with the Railway Commissioners. Parliament foresaw the difficulty, and attempted to regulate railways indirectly by strengthening canal competition in the way we have seen. Indeed, even now it has not lost heart in that method, for certain clauses with the same object were introduced into the Regulation of Railways Act, 1873. Railway companies have, therefore, as we said, no reason to complain of canal competition. The public have a right to complain that that competition is not effective. But the question here is, Will not this new kind of canal be more effective than its predecessors? We have seen that the Committee of 1872 almost despaired of “general and powerful competition with railways” from inland water navigation, but they also reported that “there is real and effective competition between railways and the traffic by sea, especially in the carriage of heavy goods, and this competition is likely to continue, unless Parliament should give public harbours into the hands of the railway companies.” Now it is upon this fact that the hope of the promoters of the Ship Canal is rationally founded. This scheme is a happy combination. It

---

\* The Aire and Calder Navigation Company are carriers on their canal, and they not only make great profits, but by their competition keep down the railway rates in Yorkshire.

will introduce not only inland water navigation but sea competition into the most populous and industrial part of England. That the competition will thus be effective, may be the real reason why the scheme is so strenuously opposed, but that the fact that it will be effective is any reason for rejecting the Bill we cannot for a moment believe, nor has the notion that it is a reason been entertained, so far as we can gather, by any one of the Committees of Parliament who have considered the scheme. The only ground upon which it would have been possible to defeat this Bill was that the Canal, if constructed, would not effect the objects its promoters had in view, or that even if it was to be assumed that it would, the promoters ought not to be allowed to construct a Canal which might be physically injurious to the port of Liverpool and the various other ports in the estuary of the Mersey. These questions resolved themselves into various subsidiary issues, as (1) Was it possible to make and keep the deep-water channel through the estuary? (2) Would the promoters be able to raise the very large amount of capital, from £8,000,000 to £10,000,000, which was necessary for the construction? (3) Would there be trade enough to make the Canal pay? and the like. The main question, however, upon which the fate of the Bill depended was, whether the Canal could be constructed without physical injury to Liverpool and Garston, as ports? This question, it will be seen, was one of far more than local interest. The silting up of the estuary of the Mersey—and that was what was prophesied by the opponents of the scheme—would be nothing less than a national calamity.

In the Sessions of 1883 and 1884 the promoters proposed to make an ordinary Ship Canal between Manchester and Runcorn. There were one or two interesting engineering features of this part of the undertaking. The locks, for instance, which were to be the means of keeping the water level at Manchester, sixty feet higher than at Runcorn, were to be constructed in sets of three, a little one for the barges, and two larger ones for the ships of greater burden. The water, too, in these locks was ingeniously economized—the half of each lockful of water flowing into and being used in the other locks. The means, too, by which the existing Bridgewater Canal at Barton was to be preserved as a continuous water communication without obstructing the Ship Canal, was interesting and ingenious. The Bridgewater Canal, where it crossed the Ship Canal, was to be turned into a water-tight box or bath, and to be turned round on a pivot, like the North-Eastern Railway Company's bridge over the Ouse, between Goole and Hull, so as to leave an open pathway for ships on the Canal—then turned round again, so as to make a continuous overhead water-way for the barges on the



**Bridgewater.** About these and the other engineering features of the Canal proper, there was practically no contest. The promoters proposed to deviate the existing railways, so as to carry them over the Ship Canal, at a height of not less than 75 feet above the water-level of the Canal. Of course, while this entailed a very large expense upon the promoters, it entailed the necessity, on the part of the railway companies, of working over heavier gradients; but although something was made of this objection, it ultimately "boiled down" to very little. The utmost that could be made of it was that on passenger trains on the main line going south from Warrington, there might be a loss of about a minute in time, or an extra expenditure of a few shovelfuls of coal; and that the working of the incline on the same line with goods trains would necessitate the use of probably three bank engines. But, as we have said, these were quite minor objections. It was the seaward communication of the Canal, from Runcorn to Garston, that was most seriously objected to. There the promoters proposed to construct a deep-water channel by means of half-tide training walls, not rising above the level of the neighbouring sandbanks. This channel was to be 10 miles long, and was to be 300 feet wide at its upper or Runcorn end, and 1,000 feet wide at its lower or Garston end. Its depth at low water of spring tides was to be 12 feet.

It was said that the channel through the upper Mersey had wandered about over almost every part of the estuary; had been at one time on the Lancashire, and at another on the Cheshire side, but that, with all its wanderings, the two ends of the channel had been always at the same points—opposite Hale Head on the one hand, and Garston on the other; that it had been swung about like a skipping-rope, but that the two ends had been fixed. The proposal, then, was to fix the channel between these two points, and it was ably argued that the result of so "stereotyping" the channel would have no deleterious effect upon the upper Mersey or the Bar. It was upon this point that issue was joined. It was agreed upon all hands that anything which would have the effect of materially diminishing the tidal capacity of the Mersey, would cause accretion in the estuary, and would probably result in shoaling on the Liverpool Bar, which is kept down by the scour of the tides. The engineers who were called against the scheme said that the fixing of the channel would in time diminish the tidal capacity, for they said that at present the sands in the upper Mersey have a tendency to accumulate, and that it is only by the shifting of the channel by the erosive action of that shifting that what are locally known as "frets" are brought about, and that if you fix the channel you will prevent "frets," upon which the con-

tinuance of the tidal capacity depends. There was great confidence in this theory, upon the part of the various engineers, Mr. Vernon Harcourt, Mr. Eades, Mr. Stevenson, Mr. Barry, Sir Frederick Bramwell, and the rest, and at least an equal amount of confidence upon the part of the promoters' witnesses, Mr. Leader Williams, Mr. Adamson, Mr. Abernethy, Mr. Messant, Mr. Deas, Mr. Fowler, and Mr. Wheeler, that "frets" were not a remedial agent, and that no such result as that anticipated would be produced by the fixing of the channel. This, then, was the very difficult question which was submitted to Parliament in 1884, and the same question was, to some extent, before it in 1883. One thing must have struck every impartial person, and that was the curious fact that engineers could be found to differ so widely as to such a matter. An ignorant person would have thought that the effect of such works would be a matter of common knowledge. There have been extensive works carried out for the improvement of the Clyde, the Tyne, the Tees, the Seine, and many other rivers. A few years ago, a Bill became an Act of Parliament, authorizing works for the improvement of the Ribble up to Preston; and this Session there are two Bills before Parliament, one for improving the navigation of the Dee, and the other for improving the navigation of the Cart at Paisley. But although gentlemen like Mr. Deas, Mr. Messant and Mr. Fowler, relied upon their experience of similar operations on the Clyde, the Tyne, and the Tees, the opponents denied that there was any analogy between these rivers and the Mersey. When such gentlemen differ, it is by no means easy to come to a confident conclusion, and it is not therefore matter for wonder, that while the Committee of the House of Lords, presided over by the Duke of Richmond and Gordon, passed the Bill, the Committee of the House of Commons, of which Mr. Sclater Booth was chairman, rejected it. This should cause the less surprise, when it is remembered that in the House of Commons the opponents said, not only does the scheme proposed threaten the very existence of Liverpool and Garston as ports, but if Manchester does want to make a Canal and get to the sea, there is a way in which that can be done without causing any physical injury to these ports. It was said that Mr. Lyster, the capable engineer of the Mersey Dock Board, had devised a scheme for continuing the Canal from Runcorn down to the deep-water at Eastham, along the Cheshire shore, which would be open to none of the objections which were then being urged against the deep-water channel.

Sir William Forwood too, speaking for the Liverpool Corporation, denied that Liverpool was opposed to the making of a Manchester Ship Canal or afraid of the competition it would set

up; that they had no objection whatever to the scheme as far as Runcorn; and "if the promoters would bring in a Bill carrying out their estuary work either along the northern or southern shores, we will not upon principle oppose that Bill next year." And a similar pledge was made by the leading counsel for the Dock Board in the precise words in which Sir William Forwood made it. How these promises have been carried out we may see hereafter, but at present we say they were no doubt part of the reason why the House of Commons Committee rejected the scheme of last year.

This Session the promoters have, as we said, come again. The chairman of the committee of promoters is not only an able engineer, but he is a man of indomitable energy and perseverance. He is deeply interested in more than one of the industries which have suffered in South Lancashire and elsewhere, and he has pressed forward again in the interests of a large and anxious public to obtain the sanction of Parliament to a Ship Canal scheme, and we cannot doubt that if the Bill is obtained his great energy will carry this large enterprise to a successful issue. This year the scheme is modified in some important particulars. The terminal docks have been taken more into the town of Manchester, the gradients of the deviated railways have been slightly improved in the interests of the railway companies which have to run over them; but the main difference between the plans of this and of last Session is that the Canal is continued along the southern shore of the estuary in the way suggested by Mr. Lyster last year. The engineer of the scheme (Mr. Leader Williams) which is now before Parliament, had designed his own canal before he saw the plan which had been prepared by the engineer to the Mersey Dock Board, but there is a startling similarity between the two. There are some minor differences, of course. The promoters' scheme involved a greater amount of dredging at Eastham, because they proposed to sink the sill of their entrance lock some 20 feet, while Mr. Lyster only proposed to go down 12 feet with his sill. There was, too, more abstraction of tidal capacity by the one scheme than by the other, for Mr. Lyster proposed to compensate for the abstraction which was involved in his plans by dredging elsewhere; but after all these differences were of very minor importance. All the main features of the two schemes were the same. In both cases the Canal was continued from Runcorn downwards to Eastham, which is nearly opposite Garston, sometimes along the foreshore, sometimes through the land; in both cases the water was to be impounded by locks at Eastham, in both the flood-waters of the river Weaver and other streams were to be got rid of, either by syphons or sluices. It is probable that the conditions of the problem were so strict as

to make it necessary that there should be almost identity between the plans of two competent engineers, but the fact is that the two schemes were very like one another. It did, therefore, seem difficult to some impartial persons to see upon what grounds the Corporation of Liverpool and the Dock Board could, in view of the pledges given in the Session of 1884, and in view of the plan of the engineer of the Dock Board which has been referred to, oppose the Bill. But, rightly or wrongly, they did oppose the scheme with a strenuousness which has marked their best efforts upon former occasion. We are far from saying that they were not justified in their opposition. They said that the Canal was not in fact brought down to the deep-water at Bromborough as it ought to have been, but that as it stopped at Eastham, Mr. Leader Williams has to bring the deep-water to the Canal, and that to do so he would have to dredge and maintain a channel for a distance of a mile and a half or two miles. So far the facts seem to have been admitted. The difference of opinion arose as to the probable effect of this channel. The opponents, the Mersey Dock Board, said that the effect would be to cause the water to flow with greater velocity upon the Cheshire side of the estuary, and that the ultimate result would be that the tides would flow upon that side of the estuary, and would in consequence of the promoters' works remain fixed on that side of the Mersey, and that consequently all the evils which had been anticipated from the fixed channel of 1884 would result from these works of 1885. They pointed out that not only would the dredging of a channel have that effect, but that the flattening of the curves of the concave side of the estuary by the walls and embankments of the Ship Canal, which would have the effect of obliterating some of the bays which at present exist, would tend to bring about the same result. As against these theories the promoters urged that while the effect of the dredging would doubtless be to increase the velocity of the tides at that particular place, that that velocity would be stopped and deflected in the future as it had been in the past by the projecting Poolhall rocks and Stanlow Point, which their scheme left untouched. They also said that it was not the flood-tides which determined the channels of the estuary, but that these were cut out and changed by the ebb-tides, assisted by the waters of the land-floods. All these points seem to have been brought out with admirable clearness before the Committee of the House of Lords. There was another important point which was taken by the London and North-Western Railway Company as the owners of the Docks at Garston, and that was that the dredging operations at Eastham would in effect extend the "Sloyn deeps." They then referred to various charts which they asserted showed that whenever the Garston deeps were good the Sloyn

deepes were shoaled, and that, on the other hand; whenever there was an extension or improvement of the Sloyn deepes, the deep-water went further away from the Garston Dock entrances. They inferred; therefore, that this improvement of the Sloyn deepes in connection with the Ship Canal would have the effect of permanently deteriorating the deep-water approaches to their Garston Docks. Upon these very important points we do not propose to say anything in this place, because they must shortly be considered by a Committee of the House of Commons. But there are certain features of the case for the Bill which are not really contested, and upon these matters we may without impropriety say something.

At one time it seemed that the most serious opposition to the Bill would be offered by those persons who were interested in the docks or navigations which communicate with the Mersey on its southern side. The trustees of the Weaver navigation, the owners of Runcorn Docks, and the owners of the Docks at Ellesmere Port, appeared in opposition on the ground that while at the present time they had free access to the estuary, the promoters proposed to place their Canal between them and the Mersey. It is true the promoters did provide locks for the convenient access of vessels to these navigations, and that the existence of the Canal, which could never have less than 12 feet of water in it, was likely to be in many ways a considerable convenience to the vessels and barges using these ports and that navigation. It is not surprising therefore to find that terms were very soon arranged between the trustees of the Weaver, and that ultimately an understanding was come to as to the Runcorn Docks. The Shropshire Union Canal Company, who are the owners of the Docks at Ellesmere, continued to oppose, but that fact is to be accounted for more by the circumstance that that company is really the London and North-Western Railway Company under another name, than by any particular inconvenience which was anticipated there.

One or two points in connection with the commercial case are worthy of notice. The anticipation of the promoters is that the construction of the Canal will enable the producers and consumers of the Manchester district to save one-half of the transit charges which are at present made. They expect that the cotton trade alone will save about £508,000 per annum if the Canal is constructed. Of course it is not difficult to discount the hopes of promoters, but for the proposition that the saving to be effected would be very substantial a convincing case was made. It is true that Liverpool cotton brokers think that the trade cannot be done without them, a natural but erroneous idea, and some persons gave evidence that even if the Canal were constructed it would be impossible to transfer the cotton market

from Liverpool to Manchester. In support of that view—which does not seem to have any *à priori* probability—they instanced the fact that although Fleetwood is a cheap port, and although, notwithstanding its much greater distance from Manchester, the railway rates between the two places are not higher than those between Liverpool and Manchester—that practically very little trade is done through that port. But their argument seems founded upon a very shallow fallacy. What the promoters of this Bill say is, that the cotton wants to get to Manchester and the district round about it. The persons who buy the cotton—the spinners, all sell their yarn in Manchester. They are in Manchester every day, or several days in the week, for that purpose, and that if they could get the cotton to Manchester they would purchase it there. They have no occasion to go to Liverpool, and still less, if one may say so, to go to Fleetwood, and hence if they have to purchase cotton there they must have recourse to a broker. That Fleetwood is not a cotton port is no reason for arguing that there could not be a cotton market at Manchester. Already a great deal of cotton is sent direct to Manchester and the district, and some of it is sold to the spinners by merchants in Manchester. So much is that the case, that the cotton porters of Liverpool, who get their livelihood by handling the cotton there, are at present complaining of starvation, and have applied to the Corporation of Liverpool to find them employment (*Standard*, May 23, 1885). Our own view is, that although no doubt all the persons who are interested in the present inconvenient system will resist as best they can the transference of the cotton market from one town to another, that the market will find its way to the place where it is most convenient for the persons who buy and sell. And that the construction of a Ship Canal to Manchester would tend to make Manchester the cotton market of England, and would tend to make an end of cotton brokers as a class, seems very obvious.

There is another trade which it is said will find its way on to the Canal, and that is the important coasting trade. At present Manchester and the immense consuming district which surrounds it draw many supplies from other parts of the United Kingdom. Many of these come to Liverpool or Holyhead or Runcorn, or other ports coastwise. Thus iron ore comes in considerable quantities from Scotland; provisions and cattle in large quantities from Ireland; vegetables in large quantities from the Channel Islands and Penzance. That the Canal would lend itself to this traffic, and be as it were a great feeding-bottle for Manchester, seems certain. But besides the coasting trade in matters which are consumed in the district, there is a considerable trade possible from our coasts to Manchester for transhipment

and export to foreign countries. It might seem that ships would scarcely go the whole way up the Canal, some thirty-four miles, to have their cargoes carried back again by outward-going vessels. But there is no improbability in this. There is a much larger coasting trade done at London, notwithstanding its distance from the sea, than at Liverpool. In connection with these anticipations of the promoters, an important point was raised as to the construction of docks at the present time. It was said the construction of a dock at Manchester is a mistake, the tendency is to construct deep-water docks as near the sea as possible. This tendency was illustrated by the existence of Grimsby at the mouth of the Humber; by the construction of the Portishead and Avonmouth Docks at the mouth of the river Avon; by the fact that the London Docks themselves are going seaward. A few years ago there was a Thames Deep-water Dock authorized on Dagenham marshes, and a year or two afterwards the East and West India Dock Company got a Bill for the construction of their dock at Tilbury, which is in course of construction. But curiously, there are many facts on the other side. For instance, there is a great dock being constructed at Hull, although Grimsby is nearer the sea. The Bristol Corporation has recently spent large sums in improving the navigation of the river. Garston, that successful little port, is higher up the estuary than Liverpool, and although Glasgow has a seaward rival in Greenock, the Clyde navigation trustees are at present constructing a very large dock at Glasgow, which was only authorized in 1883. More than one line of steamers too, it is said, have ceased to make their home station at Southampton and have come to London. There is not, we fear, very much to be made out of the instances either way.

One important feature of the scheme is the facilities it will afford for the export of Lancashire and South Yorkshire coal. It is known that the greatest attractions a port can offer to ships to come to it is the probability of rapid despatch and of a back cargo. In this respect Glasgow has the "pull over" Greenock, although to reach Glasgow vessels have to go up what is practically a canalized river, and pay somewhat higher dues. Now coal is a very available commodity for back cargoes. Some years ago, the Hull and Barnsley Railway and Dock were authorized, mainly on evidence that a direct line to the South Yorkshire coal-fields would with facilities for despatch bring a trade to the new dock, by reason of the fact that it would be possible to offer a back-cargo of Barnsley hard steam coal. The Ship Canal Company have made special provisions for a coal trade at a place called Partington, which is nearer to the centre of the Wigan or South Lancashire coal-field than any other port.

At present Garston does a very large trade in coal, and is, as we know, so crowded that the owning company has for some time contemplated the necessity of increasing the dock accommodation; and we cannot conceive any reason why Lancashire coal should not be exported in large quantities by means of the Ship Canal. But Lancashire coal, although in many ways an excellent coal, is not, as compared with certain other descriptions, so excellent for steam purposes. The large quantities of coal which go to Birkenhead and Liverpool from North and South Wales for "bunkering" purposes is of itself evidence of that fact. But the Barnsley hard steam coal is of a very excellent quality, second, if second to any, only to the best South Wales coal. But although the Midland coal-field contains this excellent coal in almost inexhaustible quantity, a coal which is admirably suited for export, that coal-field can scarcely be said to be in the export trade. The percentage of the out-put exported from the Northumberland field, is about 37 per cent. From the South Wales coal-field it is over 60 per cent., and from the Midland coal-field, which comprises not only South and West Yorkshire, but runs south into Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire, it is less than 5 per cent. That these facts are to be accounted for by the facilities which coals from Northumberland and South Wales have of getting to the sea-board, is obvious; and the bringing of a port thirty miles nearer to South Yorkshire must, we should say, develop the export trade from that field. It is from various considerations like these that the promoters have come to the conclusion that their Canal will pay. Calculations were laid before the Committee of the House of Lords, to show that the probable traffic on the Canal at the end of ten years from the present time, would probably be 9,649,316 tons, and that the revenue which would be derived from the tolls and dues upon that traffic would amount to £1,492,282. As against this calculation, however, the opponents through Mr. Finlay put in a table showing that the traffic carried from Liverpool, Garston, and the other Mersey ports, to all the stations within a radius of about twelve miles of Manchester, only amounted to 2,492,000 tons in the year. But his calculation was open to the objection that he had not included traffic coming to that district from Holyhead or Barrow or Glasgow or Hull, and many other places; and that his figures included not the traffic passing through the district, but merely the local traffic to the stations of destination. The trade in and out of Liverpool (port) is something like 15,000,000 tons, which is distributed all over the United Kingdom, and collected from innumerable places. To calculate what was sent to stations within twelve miles of Liverpool, would give no impression whatever of the trade done



through Liverpool as a port, and consequently the appositeness of this table was denied by the promoters of the scheme.

There were, of course, a great many minor matters in dispute. It was said, for instance, that in calculating that the canal and dock could be maintained for 15 per cent. of the gross receipts, the promoters were over-sanguine, although they had founded their figure upon the much smaller cost of maintenance shown to be necessary in the case of the Suez Canal. Further, it was said that there would be a difficulty in navigating the Canal, that the cost of converting "pole masts" into "fiddled masts," so as to enable vessels to pass under the bridges, would be considerable; that an extra freight would be charged by ship-owners for going up the Canal to Manchester, and that underwriters would demand a higher premium of insurance. These and other points were stoutly contested, evidence of a conflicting character was given upon each of them. But none of them could have any material bearing upon the decision of the case. In any controversy a good many side-issues are started, just as in a river there are whirls and eddies. But these, for our purpose here, may without danger be disregarded.

There is one other aspect of this matter to which it will be worth while to allude. We have already pointed out that railways have been afraid of their rivals in the carrying trade—canals. We have seen that Parliament long clung to the belief that the active competition between these two means of carriage would result in public benefit. We have pointed out by what means the Legislature endeavoured to encourage and strengthen that competition. But long before any effective steps were taken by Parliament in that direction, railway companies had already got possession of important inland water-ways, or of what was as important to them, links in the inland canal system. The Report of the Joint Select Committee on Railway Amalgamation, which was appointed in 1872, spoke thus of this matter:—"It would seem that railway companies have, in the case of canals, more than the usual motives for suppressing their rivals, and if they can obtain control of a canal, for putting an end to its traffic. On railways they are carriers as well as owners of the road, and earn profit in both capacities. On canals they carry, if at all, only in competition with other barge-owners. Further, the railway companies seldom, if ever, have the whole of a great through-route by canal, and consequently it is their interest in such cases to send the traffic by railway, where they have the whole route in their own hands, rather than by canal, where they have only a part." The fact is that Parliament stirred in this matter of canal competition too late, and has not been thoroughly whole-hearted in the matter even since it formulated

a policy. The fact is that important canals are still passing into the hands of railway companies. Only a few years ago the Midland Railway Company sought to obtain possession of the Thames and Severn Canal, and failing in that, if we remember aright, sought by their Omnibus Bill to take certain of the wharves, towing-path, or other necessary works of the canal, for the purpose of constructing a new station at Stroud. This proposal was however, upon opposition, rejected. But even when Parliamentary sanction is withheld, railway companies find a means of having their own way. An attempt was at one time made to transfer the Bridgewater Canal, a very important water communication in South Lancashire, to certain railway companies, and when Parliament refused to allow the transfer—the canal, that refusal notwithstanding, was bought up by certain gentlemen, who happened to be directors of the very railway companies which had desired to become its possessors. Of course these gentlemen worked the canal as if it had been the property of the railway companies. The rates charged upon it were agreed or “conference” rates—that is, rates which were arranged in conference with its rivals, the railway companies. Instead of competing in the interest of the public, it ceased to compete. Now during these recent proceedings on the Ship Canal Bill in the House of Lords, the owners of the Bridgewater agreed to sell their undertaking to the Ship Canal Company for the sum of £1,700,000. This transfer is of itself a very important matter in the interests of the public. The Bridgewater Canal carries a very large amount of traffic and makes a net profit of something like £60,000 a year. Whether it is worth what has been paid for it we do not know, and indeed we are not concerned whether it is or not. But we are concerned that the important water-way should be used not merely as a furtherance of the railway policy of monopoly, but that it should be used in the interest of the industries of this country in keeping railway policy in check, and in tempering the wind of railway monopoly to the shorn lamb, the trader. The freeing of this canal from railway influence is of itself a very important matter to the trade of that part of the country. But beyond that this new enterprise will have, we believe, a far-reaching and material effect upon all the other canals with which, through the Rochdale Canal at Manchester, it will communicate. The introduction of such a canal into the midst of the punier water-ways of South Lancashire and Yorkshire will strengthen the whole family. There is not much chance of the Ship Canal passing into the hands of railway companies—indeed, we believe that it will ultimately pass from the hands of the company into those of a public trust. The interest of the owners of the Ship

Canal, whoever they may be, will be to foster and encourage the traffic upon all the canals with which it communicates. These, in connection with the Ship Canal will, we believe, become very important trade highways for the whole of that part of England. It is in consequence of these possibilities which are, if we may use the expression, "on the cards," that we regard this Bill as one of the most important which has been introduced into Parliament for a great many years. Not only may the immediate anticipations of the promoters as to the savings which will be effected be realized; but still greater purposes, which are to some extent hidden from the eyes of the present furtherers of the scheme, will, we believe, be effected by this new departure in legislation. It is because of the permanent interests which are involved, directly and indirectly, in this great enterprise that we have thought it worth while to discuss some of the matters in connection with the Manchester Ship Canal Bill of 1885 in this place.

---

#### ART. IV.—GIRTON COLLEGE IN 1885.

ALL social or educational reforms have begun so quietly and imperceptibly that it is difficult, when the reform is fully accomplished, to trace its exact origin. When the time is ripe, the need begins to be felt in many minds, until at last the feeling is translated into action, and in some obscure corner, it may be, a step is taken, which becomes the germ of a wide-spread movement. This has been the case in the great reform which has taken place in female education. The visible result already attained is to be found in the establishment of women's colleges at both our universities: the eldest of these forms the subject of our paper.

The idea that women who had already left school should have the opportunity of systematically pursuing studies in the higher branches of learning was a new departure from the received theories of female education; that they should do so in colleges at the universities was a thing unheard of. It used to be assumed that the training received by girls between the ages of nine and nineteen was sufficient to fit them to meet all the responsibilities of life. But when it was found that through a variety of social changes in England many women were obliged by their labour to support themselves and others, it gradually came to be recognised by the most clear-sighted of those who were working for the reformation of the education of girls that a correspondingly higher education must also be given to women, and finally it became

plain that nothing short of a "university" course would give their work the necessary marketable value. Classes of various kinds had been opened for women, but although the results of these were successful as far as they went, they only served to accentuate the conviction that the real want was a systematic, continuous, course of study extending over a definite period of time.

This view of things naturally produced great opposition, but in spite of difficulties it was determined to make the attempt and to carry out the experiment on a small scale. From our present standpoint it is curious to look back on this germ, the growth of which began at Hitchin, and to consider the problems which beset the thorny path of the early pioneers of university education for women. First and foremost the question arose whether women were sufficiently aware of the opportunity about to be offered to them, to make them care to avail themselves of it; and then, if they did so care, would they have courage to face the comments of the world on such a novel enterprise? And, again, the practical questions arose, where should the college be situated? would it be possible to procure the services of competent professors? These and other doubtful points were real obstacles in the path.

After much consideration a house was hired at Hitchin—a convenient situation, lying, as it does, half way between London and Cambridge, and as near the latter as was in those days thought compatible with the reverence with which the mother university should be approached. Here, therefore, in 1869, six courageous students ventured to open the campaign, and much praise is due to them for the earnestness with which they took up their work, and the perseverance with which they contended against the many difficulties before them. During this time, the Cambridge lecturers who gave instruction at Hitchin showed themselves staunch friends to the new cause: the valuable time occupied in railway journeys was considerable, and great patience must have been needed to teach pupils who, though eager to learn, had had no advantages of preliminary training.

While at Hitchin several students satisfied the Cambridge examiners in the tripos examinations. One took a second class in mathematics, and two were declared to have taken honours in classics, but the examiners objected at that time to giving information, except privately, as to the class obtained in this tripos.

The inevitable discomforts suffered by the students while studying in a house not specially adapted for the purpose, and the probable increase in numbers which would involve addition to the hired house, necessitated building a college to afford sufficient accommodation; a site was accordingly chosen on the only available freehold land—some rising ground near Girton, a village about two miles from Cambridge, on the Huntingdon Road. The

plans chosen were those submitted by Mr. Waterhouse, for a red-brick quadrangular building. It consisted first of one wing only, with rooms for about twenty students, care being taken to secure ground enough to allow of enlarging the building, and also to afford ample space for garden and recreation grounds. The money for the proposed scheme was raised either by loans, or by gifts from friends, and in October, 1873, the new college was advanced enough for the students to take up their residence at Girton.

The accommodation thus provided was, however, in a few more years found insufficient, an increasing number of women being, by this time, anxious to gain the advantages of a university education. The building was therefore enlarged in 1878, and then formed two sides of a large quadrangle, with Gothic windows and picturesque gables, accommodating about fifty-five students. The applications for admission again becoming more numerous, the building was once more enlarged, and another wing was thrown out to the east, the whole forming a sort of T shape; the original picturesque plan was departed from in order to secure more healthy conditions of light and air than would have been possible had the orthodox collegiate design been carried out. Additions have also lately been made to the dining-hall and servants' offices, and a handsome library built: this enlargement east and west of the main building prevents the general effect being spoiled by a too uniform regularity. The accommodation is now sufficient for eighty students. A picturesque little lodge was built at the entrance to the grounds in 1882 by the kind liberality of the Dowager Lady Stanley of Alderley.

The fee paid by each student is £35 per term; it is very creditable to the financial administration of the college that out of this sum, which includes tuition, board, and the expenses of carriages to and from all lectures attended in Cambridge, a large sum has already been available to meet the building expenses, though we hope that friends of the movement will be forthcoming to obviate the necessity of too great a demand on these annual profits. Several of the City companies have been liberal in founding scholarships; three valuable scholarships are regularly given by the Clothworkers' Company; recently, similar benefactions have been presented by the Skinners' and Drapers' Companies; the Goldsmiths' Company has also for some time past kindly given help. Gifts of this nature have a special value since so many of those to whom a university training is almost a necessity for the competent performance of the duties of their profession are unable to secure the requisite funds without the aid of a scholarship.

The course of study pursued by a university man, whether reading for honours or for the ordinary degree, needs no description here; so far as study is concerned the women students follow exactly the same curriculum, and take the same examination papers as the men, the principal difference throughout their career being in the rewards ultimately obtained for ability shown and work done. Up to 1882 the only substitute for a degree obtainable by a Girton student was a certificate presented by the college committee, as the college remained unrecognized by the university. The Girton examination papers were looked over and marked merely through courtesy and friendliness on the part of the examiners; and there was not at this time certain provision for adequate teaching as the valuable help given by the lecturers was not part of their university work. But at a meeting of the Senate in 1882 the question of incorporating women's colleges came up for consideration, and an interesting contest took place, which will long be memorable in the annals of the university. Since this time the university has undertaken to provide teaching and examiners, and has conferred a certificate on all those who satisfy the examiners in the honour examinations. This latter favour does not yet extend to those who take the ordinary degree, and only a college certificate can be obtained by them, although the examinations passed during this course are those the university prescribes for men students—viz., the "previous" or "little-go," "general" and "special." "Though much be done, there yet remains a 'grace' to be conferred."

When we consider how often opponents of the movement urge the danger of too great mental strain for women, the present arrangements, which make it necessary for women students to take the most difficult work in order to obtain the official recognition of the university, seem somewhat inconsistent. It has been argued that only women of rare intellectual endowment and earnestness of purpose should undertake a university career, and that if such privilege be allowed to women at all, it should be granted to the few, and in exceptional cases, but the claims of justice can never be satisfied by any such restriction, since both men and women with ordinary abilities may have to earn their own livelihood, and unfortunately the absence of provision does not ensure special intellectual capacities in either sex.

The terms kept at Girton are those prescribed by the university; residence being also allowed under due supervision in the long vacation. But all the social and domestic arrangements, as may naturally be supposed, differ considerably from those of the men's colleges. The rules are wisely chosen, and are not more

strict than is necessary for the organization of so large a community, considerable scope being allowed for individual action. Perhaps the most necessary rules are those relating to hours. Each student is required to initial the marking roll before 9 A.M., between 12 and 3 P.M., and again between 6 and 7 P.M., unless special leave of absence is given. Students are also obliged to be in the college by 11 P.M., even when permission to spend the evening in Cambridge has been given by the mistress. No masculine visitors except parents and guardians are allowed in the students' rooms; there is a public reception-room, however, where friends may be received subject to the mistress' approval. Students are not allowed to go into college rooms in Cambridge without some chaperone, and no lecture can be missed without leave from the mistress.

Each student has practically two rooms, the sitting-room and bedroom being divided by folding doors; on the upper corridor, however, the rooms are single, but they are large enough to be divided by a heavy curtain. Girton College has been called one of the most social places in the world, and the household arrangements give every facility for intercourse among the students without unduly encroaching on hours of study. After prayers, breakfast is served in hall, and is on the table till 9 A.M.; luncheon, also in hall, is served from 12 till 3; tea is taken round to the various rooms during the afternoon, so that the hours from 4 to 6, generally devoted to work, may not be interrupted; for dinner all the students assemble together, and the hall presents a lively appearance—upwards of seventy sit at the long tables, and conversation flows merrily. The mistress and resident lady lecturers sit at a smaller table in the picturesque bow-window. Perhaps the most social gatherings of all are the little teas; trays are taken round to the rooms in the evening, and at about 9 P.M., when work is over, it is the custom to invite friends; very pleasant are these little gatherings where the mistress and lecturers are sometimes present, entering heartily into the discussions, either grave or gay, according to the spirit of the hour. Lights are put out in the corridors at 10 P.M., but there is no restriction as to the hour to which students may remain in each others' rooms, or sit up reading; their own good sense seems to afford a sufficient guarantee in these matters.

Work, as a rule, begins about 9 A.M., and is continued till 12 or 1 o'clock; after luncheon, walks and tennis are the favourite amusements. Students choose their own hours of work, the average amount being six or seven hours a day, according to the course of study; mathematical students usually working shorter hours than classical. Lectures are carefully arranged

with reference to the individual needs of the different students, care being taken to avoid undue pressure. The number of lectures taken by a student varies with her particular course of work. Very many lectures in Cambridge, formerly attended by men only, are now open to women, which is a great advantage; and where there are no lectures suitable, or where they are restricted to men, extra lectures can always be arranged in college. Students, as a rule, work in groups, attracted by mutual sympathy or talent, and much praise is due to the kindly help they give to each other, more especially to the new students during their first terms, when the work and arrangements are comparatively unknown. The kind and untiring patience of the lecturers must not pass unnoticed; no trouble is ever spared in helping a student both by explanations of difficult work and by extra papers.

Societies of all descriptions flourish in the college: notable among these are the choral, debating, and Browning societies; there are also various clubs for lawn-tennis, racquets, gymnasium, &c. We must not omit to mention the fire brigade, started some years ago to meet the obvious difficulty and delay in obtaining assistance from Cambridge in time of need, and also as a means of cultivating prompt action in cases of emergency; the practices are well attended and actively kept up. But in spite of the many social attractions, any reference to the class lists give ample evidence that work is not neglected; the much coveted first in honours is now no uncommon achievement, and a high place among wranglers is not unknown.

So far as we have traced the history of this modern social experiment it is clear that the predictions of inevitable and hopeless failure which greeted its first announcement have been for ever silenced; the trial has been made, and victory remains with the experimenters; public opinion is beginning to look more leniently on the winning side, and opponents are shifting their ground.

Let it be allowed, however, that the average woman can do the average amount of intellectual work required by our universities; that exceptional women can be found who can take the highest honours; let it be admitted that the facilities for study given to women and all the detailed arrangements of their college life are admirable, the question still remains, how are we better than our forefathers? And, if better, do we not pay too dearly for the new way? Is there not an eternal order in Nature which gives one set of duties to the woman, and another to the man; an order which we can but at our peril alter or subvert? Such questions as these belong to these later days. Let us see how far such difficulties can be removed.

To those who regret the good old times in which our grand-



mothers lived retiring, unobtrusive lives, giving way in all matters intellectual to the opinion of men, who dogmatized with unfailing vigour on every insignificant detail,—to those it is only necessary to point out, that to ask of one age, is it better or worse than another, is merely to state an insoluble problem which can never be fully discussed. Of generations, like individuals, it may mercifully be said, “Judge not, that ye be not judged ;” each has a strength and weakness of its own, while each presents multitudinous points of difference from the other ; change is the chief factor with which we have to deal ; things are not as they were : how shall we best adapt ourselves to the new order, how shall we best satisfy the needs of our time ?

In comparing the present with the past we cannot fail to notice in intellectual spheres a wider diffusion of superficial knowledge in proportion to what is really known than in former years. Books and pamphlets have been multiplied ; questions of deep importance, which were once only touched upon in the study, are now discussed in the drawing-room ; as a consequence, ease and readiness in handling known subjects is soon acquired at the expense of accuracy and reverence for the unknown, and this is more especially the case where systematic mental training is absent because the difficulties in the search after truth are not fully realized, and where there is little depth of thought a passing interest is more easily aroused. Surely in these days, then, there is room for a sounder mental training for women ? Is it fair to expose them to dangers unknown in former years, and yet withhold the natural antidote ? Besides the new conditions with which women have to deal, they are confronted in the present generation with new duties. Let us beware, in appealing to the womanly sphere as eternally distinct from that of men, that we do not assume such a sphere to be already bounded by final limits or incapable of growth or expansion. The needs of our time have altered—so have its duties—there is more work to be done, and women must take their share of the burden. Every year we find an increasing number of women who are compelled to provide for their own maintenance, and a higher principle than that once received leads them to give conscientious work for payment taken, and such supply is met by demand. Work amongst the poor in our own large cities is now possible, and carried out, in ways unknown in former years : but to do good and womanly work amid our complicated modern civilization requires some business capacities and a disciplined judgment, without which the kind heart would inevitably lead astray.

But perhaps the best evidence we can have of the advantages of a thorough education for women in modern times is presented by the various careers after leaving Girton of the women—nearly

two hundred—who have been in residence since the opening of the college. The majority have been occupied in teaching, and certainly more honest work, wider views, deeper insight into character, and more tolerant judgment, seem to have been produced by their previous training. At least six high schools have been entrusted to old Girton students, and most of those teaching are to be found in responsible positions. If the system of free competition awards merit to the deserving, then it is clearly proved that for the work of teaching at least, the Girton training has been tried and not found wanting. Others of those women are doing literary work, some are following the medical profession, some are helping “time to take its stand” by labouring in philanthropic and social reform, some even dare after this great “emancipation” to live at home and brighten the life there with the fresh interests and varied thoughts acquired at college—others have become wives and mothers. Thus we see that in many vocations success has been attained.

Advantages may be offered in vain, it is true, and opportunities lost; the highest intellectual training does not necessarily ensure wisdom or moral strength, so much needed in the conflict of life; but, nevertheless, we may rejoice that the chance is given to those who can avail themselves of it, and that women are no longer handicapped in the great race before them. Reforms must be worked slowly, and it is well that social experiments should be jealously watched and criticized; we are dealing with human factors, and any failure would produce fatal disaster. But it is the gift of the reformer to see beyond his time, and to estimate the needs of the future while they yet lie dormant and unfelt, and so every revolution of the wheel of human progress throws a new light which dawns with a great surprise on the sleeping world. Time and practical experience alone can prove the genius of the discoverer, and looking back over the history of this educational movement in England, it seems impossible any longer to doubt the foresight of the promoters or to question the ultimate verdict of the world at large.

---

ART. V.—THE GROWTH OF COLONIAL ENGLAND :  
BRITISH NORTH AMERICA.

1. *The Expansion of England*. By J. R. SEELEY, M.A., Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge. Macmillan & Co. 1883.
2. *Montcalm and Wolfe*. By FRANCIS PARKMAN. 2 vols. Macmillan & Co. 1884.
3. *Parliamentary Procedure and Practice, with an Introductory Account of the Origin and Growth of Parliamentary Institutions in the Dominion of Canada*. By J. G. BOURINOT, Clerk of the House of Commons of Canada. Montreal: Dawson Brothers. London: Trübner & Co. 1884.
4. *The Statesman's Year-Book*, 1885. Macmillan & Co.
5. Official Publications of the Government of Canada.
6. *The Colonial Office List*, 1885. Harrison & Sons.
7. *Statistical Abstract for the several Colonial and other Possessions of the United Kingdom*. Twenty-first Number. Hansard & Son. 1884.

PROFESSOR SEELEY, in his admirable course of lectures delivered at Cambridge on the "Expansion of England," gives it as a favourite maxim of his, that history, while it should be scientific in its method, should pursue a practical object; that is, it should not merely gratify the reader's curiosity about the past, but modify his views of the present and his forecast of the future. Appreciating the wisdom of this dictum, we purpose, first, to take a brief survey of the progress in the past, and the position in the present, of the chief British colonies; and then, by comparing the colonies with the mother-country, and the British Empire with the Great European Powers, to submit to our readers a broader view and a juster perception of the majestic proportions of the heritage of the English people than is commonly possessed by the inhabitants of the British Isles. The amazing rapidity of expansion of the Empire and its already prodigious power cause the question of its future to be one of infinite importance and of not inconsiderable anxiety. To forecast its future we should know something of its past and be well acquainted with its present; whereas we seem, as Professor Seeley observes, to have conquered and peopled half the world in a fit of absence of mind! So little, in fact, have we allowed

the existence of our growing Empire to affect our imagination, that we have even now not ceased to think of ourselves as simply "a race inhabiting an island off the northern coast of the continent of Europe." Our turn of speech constantly betrays that we do not yet regard our colonies as part of ourselves, for we speak of the English population as dwelling in the British Isles, and few ever reckon in the millions of Canada and Australasia, and fewer still add the hundreds of thousands of those—as good Englishmen as ourselves—who carry on the battle of life in the numerous lesser colonies and possessions boasting the rule of the Queen in every land and sea. Just as in the eighteenth century the history of England was developed mainly in America and Asia, so in the latter part of the nineteenth century the momentous progress of our colonies warns us to beware of concentrating too closely our attention upon Great Britain, lest by excluding from our view the growth of Colonial England we dwarf in our imaginations the true greatness of the Empire. As an instance of the lack of a due conception of the spread of the British race, how many people upon being asked to enumerate the twenty most populous British cities, would think of including Melbourne, Sydney, and Montreal? Yet, leaving London with its four millions out of the list, the following are the fifteen chief cities and towns in order of population:\*

1. Glasgow .	674,095	6. Melbourne	305,000	11. Bristol . .	215,457
2. Liverpool .	573,202	7. Sheffield	300,563	12. Belfast . .	210,000
3. Birmingham	421,258	8. Sydney .	250,000	13. Bradford .	209,564
4. Manchester	338,296	9. Dublin .	249,602	14. Nottingham	205,298
5. Leeds . .	327,324	10. Edinburgh	236,002	15. Montreal .	200,000

And in the next fifteen would be found Adelaide and Toronto, each with over 100,000 inhabitants; and, probably before the close of the century, such thriving and rapidly increasing towns as Hamilton in Ontario, and Dunedin in New Zealand—not to mention Quebec, Halifax (Nova Scotia), Cape Town, and Brisbane—will take their places amongst the most populous communities of the Empire. At the present date there are in England alone eighteen cities and towns of over 100,000 inhabitants, and several more with populations closely verging on that number. Assuredly no great nation was ever so cramped for want of room as are the English people at home at the close of this nineteenth century. Dwelling upon this fact, Professor Seeley says:—

Populations so dense as that of modern England are a phenomenon quite new at least in Europe. We continually speak of our country

---

\* "The Statesman's Year-Book, 1885," gives the figures for the United Kingdom; those for England are for the middle of 1884, those for Scotland and Ireland are the Census figures of 1881; those for the three colonial cities are estimated for the beginning of 1885.

as crowded, and, since the rate of increase of population is tolerably constant, we sometimes ask with alarm what will be its condition half a century hence. "The territory," we say, "is a fixed quantity; we have but 120,000 square miles; it is crowded already, and yet the population doubles in some seventy years. What will become of us?" Now here is a curious example of our habit of leaving our colonial possessions out of account. What! our country is small; a poor 120,000 square miles? I find the fact to be very different. I find that the territory governed by the Queen is of almost boundless extent. Let us deduct from the vast total India, still the territory subject to the Queen is much greater than that of the United States, though that is uniformly cited as the example of a country not crowded and in which there is boundless room for expansion. It may be true that the mother-country of this great Empire is crowded, but in order to relieve the pressure it is not necessary for us, as if we were Goths or Turcomans, to seize upon the territory of our neighbours, it is not necessary even to incur great risks or undergo great hardships; it is only necessary to take possession of boundless territories in Canada, South Africa, and Australia, where already our language is spoken, our religion professed, and our laws established. If there is pauperism in Wiltshire and Dorsetshire, this is but complementary to unowned wealth in Australia; on the one side there are men without property, on the other there is property waiting for men.\*

Nevertheless we brood anxiously over the question of relieving the congested state of the labour market and its attendant pauperism, and when the colonies are suggested as affording ample remedy, we are too often met with the half-contemptuous query, "What is the good of colonies?" And here again we quote Professor Seeley:—

What is the good of colonies? That question implies that we think of a colony, not as part of the State, but as a possession belonging to it. For we should think it absurd to raise such a question about a recognized part of the body politic. Who ever thought of inquiring whether Cornwall or Kent rendered any sufficient return for the money which we lay out upon them, whether those counties were worth keeping? The tie that holds together the parts of a nation-state is of another kind; it is not composed of considerations of profit and loss, but is analogous to the family bond. The same tie would hold a nation to its colonies, if colonies were regarded as simply an extension of the nation. If Greater Britain in the full sense of the phrase really existed, Canada and Australia would be to us as Kent and Cornwall. But if once we cease to regard a colony in this way, if we consider that the emigrants who have gone forth from us have ceased to belong to our community, then we must form some other conception of their relation to us.†

It has always appeared to us that the reason why so little heed

---

\* "Expansion of England," p. 59.

† *Ibid.* p. 63.

has been given by the bulk of the home population to the affairs of the outlying portion of the Empire, is to be found, not in indifference to such affairs, but in a very general ignorance of the most elementary and superficial knowledge of the circumstances of the colonies. The following Table shows at a glance the date and manner of our acquiring possession, the area in square miles, the population in 1881, and the revenue and public debt in 1883 of each of our colonies:—

Colonies.	Date and Mode of Acquisition.	Area in square miles.	Population in 1881.	Revenue. 1883.	Debt. 1883.
EUROPE—				£	£
Gibraltar . .	Capture, 1704 . .	1 $\frac{1}{2}$ ...	18,381 ...	48,335 ...	...
Heligoland . .	Ditto 1807 . .	$\frac{1}{2}$ ...	2,001 ...	8,212 ...	4,697
Malta and Gozo . .	Ditto 1800 . .	117 ...	149,782 ...	205,666 ...	79,168
Cyprus . .	{ Occupied conditionally under Treaty, 1878 }	3,584 ...	185,916 ...	194,051 ...	...
ASIA—					
Ceylon . .	Capitulation, 1796	24,702 ...	2,768,984 ..	1,162,179 ...	2,124,108
Hong Kong . .	Treaty, 1843 . .	3 $\frac{1}{2}$ ...	160,402 ...	268,635 ...	...
Straits Settlements . .	{ Separated from India, 1867 . }	1,445 $\frac{1}{2}$ ...	423,834 ...	559,020 ...	56,000
Labuan . .	Cession, 1846 . .	30 ...	6,298 ...	5,114 ...	...
AFRICA—					
Cape of Good Hope . .	{ Capitulation, 1806 .	240,108 ...	1,249,824 ...	3,299,017 ...	19,671,859
Natal . .	Settlement, 1838 .	18,750 ...	402,687 ...	620,496 ...	2,554,000
Mauritius . .	Capitulation, 1810 .	713 ...	360,847 ...	889,265 ...	758,509
St. Helena . .	Capture, 1651 . .	47 ...	5,059 ...	10,266 ...	7,750
Sierra Leone . .	Settlement, 1787 .	468 ...	60,546 ...	62,413 ...	58,000
Gambia . .	{ Settlement, 1631 } { Re-settlement, 1817 }	69 ...	14,150 ...	28,952 ...	...
Gold Coast . .	Settlement, 1661 .	15,000 ...	400,000 ...	105,617 ...	...
Lagos . .	Cession, 1861 . .	73 ...	75,270 ...	50,558 ...	...
AMERICA—					
Bermuda . .	Settlement, 1609 .	19 $\frac{1}{2}$ ...	13,948 ...	28,564 ...	5,485
British Guiana . .	{ Capitulation, 1803 .	76,000 ...	252,186 ...	478,216 ...	64,900
Honduras . .	{ Treaties, 1783 and 1786 . . . }	7,562 ...	27,452 ...	52,277 . .	..
Falkland Islands . .	{ Settlement, 1833 .	6,500 ...	1,553 ...	8,337 ...	...
Canadian Dominion . .	{ Cession and Settlement, 1623 to 1763 }	3,470,492 ...	4,324,810 ...	7,457,218 ...	42,110,460
Newfoundland . .	Settlement, 1583 .	40,200 ...	179,509 ...	261,036 .	322,713
WEST INDIES—					
Antigua . .	Ditto 1632 . .	97 ...	34,964 ...	44,055 ...	48,626
Bahamas . .	Ditto 1670 . .	5,390 ...	43,521 ...	52,475 ...	55,833
Barbadoes . .	Ditto 1605 . .	166 ...	171,889 ...	140,079 ...	...
Dominica . .	Cession, 1763 . .	291 ...	28,211 ...	21,172 ...	11,900
Grenada . .	Ditto 1763 . .	133 ...	42,043 ...	43,833 ...	6,000
Jamaica . .	Capitulation, 1655 .	4,193 ...	580,804 ...	557,241 ...	1,287,916
Montserrat . .	Settlement, 1632 .	32 ...	10,087 ...	5,862 ...	4,200
Nevis . .	Ditto 1628 . .	50 ...	11,864 }	43,203 }	2,200
St. Kitts . .	Ditto, 1623, 1650	68 ...	29,187 }		

Colonies.	Date and Mode of Acquisition.	Area in square miles.	Population in 1881.	Revenue. 1883.	Debt. 1883.
<b>WEST INDIES—continued:</b>					
St. Lucia . .	Capitulation, 1803.	237½ ...	38,551 ...	£ 43,026 ...	£ 26,450
St. Vincent .	Cession, 1763 . .	146 ...	40,548 ...	34,509 ...	...
Tobago . .	Ditto 1763 . .	114 ...	18,051 ...	14,175 ...	...
Trinidad . .	Capitulation, 1797 .	1,754 ...	153,128 ...	458,344 ...	598,630
Turk's Island	Settlement, 1629 .	169 ...	4,732 ...	10,017 ...	...
Virgin Islands	Ditto 1665 .	57 ...	5,287 ...	1,708 ...	...
<b>AUSTRALASIA—</b>					
New South Wales . .	Settlement, 1787 .	310,700 ...	751,468 ...	6,470,341 ...	21,632,459
Victoria . .	{ Separated from N.S.W., 1851 }	87,884 ...	862,346 ...	5,934,240 ...	28,825,112
Queensland . .	{ Separated from N.S.W., 1859 }	668,224 ...	213,525 ...	2,383,859 ...	14,917,850
Tasmania . .	Settlement, 1803 .	26,215 ...	115,705 ...	562,189 ...	2,385,600
South Australia . .	Ditto 1836 .	903,425 ...	279,865 ...	2,060,140 ...	13,891,900
New Zealand . .	Ditto 1841 .	104,403 ...	534,032 ...	3,871,267 ...	31,385,411
Western Australia . .	Ditto 1829 .	975,920 ...	29,708 ...	316,719 ...	611,000
Fiji . . .	Cession, 1874 . .	7,403 ...	127,095 ...	106,814 ...	254,025

From the above Table it is seen that the total area of the colonies amounts to over seven million English square miles, or fifty-eight times the extent of the United Kingdom. Of this vast dominion, over three and a half million square miles are in America, over a quarter of a million in Africa, and three millions in Australasia.

In 1884 the town and district of Berbera on the African coast, directly to the south of Aden, was garrisoned by British troops ; and a protectorate was established over so much of the island of New Guinea as lies to the east of 141° E. long., with an approximate area of 60,000 square miles, and including several groups of islands off the coast. A part also of the West African coast from Lagos to the Cameroons, including the Niger delta and the Oil Rivers, was annexed to Great Britain. The district of North Borneo, embracing about 26,000 square miles with a population of about 150,000, for which a charter was granted to the North Borneo Company in 1881, should also be included in the territories over which the British flag waves.

The cost to Great Britain, in naval and military expenditure, of her Colonial Empire, is about two millions sterling per annum. From the annexed Table it will be seen that more than one-half of this amount is paid on account of nine of the possessions, occupied chiefly on account of their importance as military and naval stations. The Table \* gives the abstract of several Parliamentary Returns, showing the actual cost to the Imperial Exchequer for the financial year 1883-4, and the estimated cost for the financial year 1884-5, with the disposition of British troops forming the ordinary garrisons :—

\* "The Statesman's Year-Book, 1885," p. 294.

Colonies.	1883-4. £	1884-5. £	Number of Troops.
Gibraltar . . . . .	337,238	326,887	5,106
Malta . . . . .	446,807	432,181	5,366
Cape Colony and Natal . . . . .	303,595	293,635	3,208
Mauritius . . . . .	44,145	31,944	472
Bermuda . . . . .	162,219	159,798	1,553
St. Helena . . . . .	22,721	24,184	269
Cyprus . . . . .	74,551	75,882	587
Hong Kong . . . . .	126,158	132,358	1,343
West Australia . . . . .	1,800	1,800	none
New South Wales . . . . .	2,769	2,941	none
Jamaica . . . . .	83,070	87,939	983
Bahamas . . . . .	9,172	9,655	100
Honduras . . . . .	14,108	15,153	200
Windward and Leeward Islands . . . . .	95,661	92,473	1,102
Canada (Halifax) . . . . .	151,712	119,133	1,433
West Coast of Africa . . . . .	55,194	52,580	613
Ceylon . . . . .	86,657	84,892	1,256
Straits Settlements . . . . .	65,153	68,221	1,046
Heligoland . . . . .	1,300	1,300	none
Falkland Islands . . . . .	590	500	none

What is of infinitely more importance to observe than the cost of two millions sterling to the Imperial Exchequer, is the proportion of her entire trade done by Great Britain with her colonies, and the growing proportion of the colonial to the foreign trade.

## UNITED KINGDOM—IMPORTS AND EXPORTS.

	1870.	1880.	1883.
	£	£	£
Foreign . . . . .	427,114,325	523,597,657	543,246,228
Colonial . . . . .	120,223,745	174,046,374	189,082,426
Totals . . . . .	547,338,070	697,644,031	732,328,654

In 1870 the foreign trade amounted to considerably more than three-fourths of the whole trade of the United Kingdom. Ten years later the foreign trade amounted to almost exactly three-fourths of the whole trade; and in 1883 the foreign trade had fallen considerably below three-fourths of the whole trade. During the same period the colonial trade of Great Britain had, of course, risen from much less than one-fourth to considerably over one-fourth of the whole trade. The change in 1884 was even more marked in favour of the colonial customers of the United Kingdom; though—owing to the universal depression in prices which resulted in the total value of the import and export trade for the year amounting to only six hundred and eighty-five millions—the figures show considerably reduced totals.

From the following Table, compiled from the Emigration Returns for 1884, will be seen at once the number of persons, of



British and Irish origin only, who have left the United Kingdom for the United States, British North America, Australasia, and all other places, from 1853 to 1884 inclusive:—

Years.	United States.	British North America.	Australasia.	All other places.
From 1853 to 1860 . . .	805,596	123,408	365,307	18,372
From 1861 to 1870 . . .	1,132,626	130,310	367,358	41,535
From 1871 to 1880 . . .	1,087,372	177,976	303,367	110,204
From 1881 to 1884 . . .	704,860	139,672	175,490	64,643
Totals . . . . .	3,730,454	571,366	1,111,522	234,754

That is to say, from 1853 to the end of 1884, Great Britain and Ireland lost  $3\frac{3}{4}$  millions of their inhabitants, who became, in the majority of cases, citizens of the United States; and that in the same period rather fewer than  $1\frac{3}{4}$  millions of her subjects emigrated to her colonies of British North America and Australasia. No doubt, had the numbers been largely increased in the latter case, it would have been fortunate alike for those who "went forth" and for those who remained "at home."

No one doubts the benefits accruing to the human race from emigration, if only in so far as it tends to equalize population over the fertile districts of the earth; but the following Table, showing the "Amount of Money remitted by SETTLERS in the *United States and British North America* to their friends in the United Kingdom," from 1848 (the first year for which there is any information) to 1884, both inclusive, affords positive evidence of the well-being of a large number of the "Settlers" and of their undiminished love for those at home:—

	Amount remitted from the United States and British North America.	From Australia and other places.
	£	£
From 1848 to 1874 . . .	18,970,000	No record kept.
1875 . . . . .	354,000	8,000
1876 . . . . .	449,000	25,000
1877 . . . . .	667,000	57,000
1878 . . . . .	784,000	51,000
1879 . . . . .	855,000	51,000
1880 . . . . .	1,403,000	71,000
1881 . . . . .	1,505,000	71,000
1882 . . . . .	1,573,000	125,000
1883 . . . . .	1,611,000	68,000
1884 . . . . .	1,575,000	61,000
Totals . . . . .	£29,776,000	£585,000

In endeavouring to place before our readers a brief survey of the leading facts of colonial history, we commence with Newfoundland—"England's oldest and most loyal colony."

It is difficult to account for the fact that Newfoundland—England's oldest and geographically nearest colony—is so little known to Englishmen. As early as 1578, Mr. Anthony Parkhurst, of Bristol, having made several voyages to the island, gives a glowing picture of it in a letter to Mr. Richard Hakluyt, of the Middle Temple, who had applied to him for information. Parkhurst says, "the soil is good and fertile," and in sundry places he had "sown wheat, barley, rye, oats, beans, pease, and seeds of herbs, kernels, plum-stones, nuts, all of which have prospered as in England. The country yieldeth many good trees of fruit, as filberts in some places, but in all places cherry-trees, and a kind of pear-tree meet to graft on. As for roses, they are as common as brambles here; strawberries, dewberries, and raspberries, as common as grass." He calls the climate temperate, and far pleasanter than might be supposed from the tales of "foolish mariners." He describes the land as containing many lakes and rivers, and many varieties of trees, animals, and fish, "cod, herring, salmon, thornbacke, plaice, oysters, mussels, lobsters, crabs," &c.; and he believed the island to be rich in minerals, having found and brought home specimens of iron and copper ore. Relegating this witness to his obscurity of three hundred years ago, we will compare with his testimony that of Mr. Justice Pinsent, of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland, an altogether honest, albeit an enthusiastic, exponent of the present climatic condition of the colony. In a paper read before the Royal Colonial Institute on 14th April last, he says: "As a salubrious, health-giving, and health-preserving climate, I will back that of Newfoundland against any in the world. . . . Strangers are always struck with the physique of the people in form, size, robust health, and strength. . . . Of fruits and flora there are no small abundance. . . . The variety of native flowers is striking; of shrubs, ferns, and grasses, there is endless variety. I need hardly add that all ordinary fruits, flowers, and vegetables of the English garden thrive well."

From the eloquent description of Mr. Justice Pinsent we are won to the belief that the rugged beauty of its hills, cliffs, and headlands, the rich luxuriance of most of its river valleys and of its wooded heights, the loveliness of its abounding lakes and clear rejoicing streams, its magnificent island-studded bays and its splendid harbours, all combine to make the resemblance of Newfoundland scenery to that of many parts of Wales and of the Scottish Highlands a very striking one.

Newfoundland has been famous for its dogs, fish, and fogs. Of

the dogs, we believe it is difficult at the present date to obtain a good specimen of a thoroughbred. Of the fogs, we are now assured by Mr. Justice Pinsent, the less we say the better for our reputation for information. Only the fish remain, and happily in as undoubted abundance as when the island was first discovered.

Despite the wording of the first charter granted in 1496 by Henry VII. to "our well-beloved John Cabot, citizen of Venice, and to Lewis, Sebastian, and Sanctus, sons of the said John," and of the second charter, which is addressed to John Cabot alone, the weight of concurrent testimony, adduced by Mr. Justice Pinsent in the paper already quoted, seems to establish the justice of the popular award which has so long designated SEBASTIAN CABOT as the first European of modern times to discover the mainland of America. It is quite likely that the moving spirit of the enterprise was John Cabot, a Genoese by birth and a Venetian by citizenship, who came to London to follow the trade of merchandise, and afterwards settled and resided near Bristol. But it was to the skill of Sebastian as "pilot" that the success of the expeditions was due. At all events no one disputes the laconic announcement in an old *Bristol Chronicle*, that "in the year 1497, the 24th June, on St. John's-day, was Newfoundland found by Bristol men in a ship called the *Mathew*."

Cabot is believed to have first "made" the coast of Labrador, and then to have coasted southwards. No doubt he sighted, and probably visited, the island of Newfoundland, which, from its numerous headlands and deep bays and innumerable islets off its north coasts, would give the first impression of being an archipelago, and as containing apparently the two large islands which Cabot reported as being passed upon his return voyage. In the Privy Purse expenses is found the following munificent item :—"Aug. 10th, 1497, To hym that found the new isle, £10."

In 1498, on his second voyage, Cabot probably got as far north as Hudson's Straits, when he was turned back by ice. He then followed the coast of the land of Baccalaos\* to 38°, and thence, being short of provisions, he returned to England.

For some thirty years after the voyages made by Cabot, little attention was paid by the merchants and adventurers of London and Bristol to the fisheries of Newfoundland; the Portuguese at once, however, quickly followed by the French and Spaniards,

\* Baccalaos, the land of codfish, was the general name at one time given to Newfoundland and Labrador; afterwards it came to be confined to a large island off the coast of Newfoundland.

embraced the opportunities for trade and fishery opened to the world by the discovery of the island.

No importance attaches to the expedition of Captain John Rut in 1527, beyond its being set on foot by Cardinal Wolsey, and the fact that Rut found in the "Haven of St. John" eleven Norman, one Breton, and two Portuguese, but no English, vessels engaged in the fisheries. A later expedition, that sailed in 1536 under the command of "Master Hoare," was ill-managed and disastrous in its results. In 1578, however, the number of vessels employed in the cod fishery is stated to have been 400, of which 50 were English. We are told that the English were commonly lords of the harbours, and helped themselves to "boatloads of salt and such, in return for protection against rovers and other violent intruders, who do often put them (the foreign fishermen) from good harbours." In that year Sir Humphrey Gilbert, half-brother to Sir Walter Raleigh, procured letters patent from Queen Elizabeth, authorizing him to search for and occupy lands which were not in the occupation of any Christian potentate. It was not until 1583, however, that Sir Humphrey succeeded in conducting an expedition, consisting of four vessels, to Newfoundland, and finally landed at St. John's on the 3rd of August, 1583. Two days later, having gathered together all the merchants and fishermen he could find on the island—and he reports having found "nearly forty sail of fishing ships of English, Portuguese, French, and Spanish in the harbour"—Sir Humphrey formally read his letters patent, and assumed possession and sovereignty of the island in the name of the Queen. Feudal symbols of turf and twig were tendered to him, and having hoisted the royal standard, he erected a wooden pillar bearing the arms of England, that all might see to whom the land thenceforth belonged. In such manner and with such ceremony was acquired our "most ancient and loyal colony." Unhappily, on his return voyage, Sir Humphrey was lost on board the *Squirrel*, the smallest vessel of his fleet, and said to have been of only ten tons burden.

Some years later, John Guy, merchant, and Mayor of Bristol, in association with Lord Bacon and a number of noblemen and gentlemen, obtained a grant of great part of Newfoundland from James I. Lord Bacon is said to have given it as his opinion that the fisheries of Newfoundland were "more valuable than all the mines of Peru," and in this opinion Edmund Burke coincided nearly two centuries later.

In 1615 Captain Whitbourne, who had been present with Sir Humphrey Gilbert at St. John's, was commissioned by the Admiralty to assume control over the people resorting to Newfoundland. Nearly three hundred English ships were then

engaged in the fisheries, and population was increasing in spite of the discouragements offered. Owing to the policy of investing the monopoly of trade and fisheries in English adventurers, and the attempt to centre all its gains in England, settlement and cultivation of the land within six miles of the shore was prohibited. Every fisherman was compelled to return to Great Britain at the close of the fishing season, and no woman was to be allowed to land on the island. The Star Chamber forbade masters and owners of ships transporting any persons to Newfoundland who were not of the ship's company. In addition to this unnatural legislation, there were the settlements of the French, to whom Charles I. granted a charter upon payment of tribute; and at every outbreak of war between England and France, the settlements of the two nations were mutually harassed, pillaged, and destroyed.

In 1674 the Lords Commissioners of Trade and Plantations represented the Newfoundland fisheries as employing 270 ships and nearly 11,000 seamen. Yet there were probably not more than 2,000 resident English inhabitants on the island. Considering that an Act of William and Mary "to Encourage the Trade to Newfoundland" continued and strengthened the policy of restricting colonization, and that the Act prevailed during the eighteenth century, it is not surprising the resident population in 1804 only numbered 20,000. Not until 1811 were the restrictions wholly removed, and only in 1833, when a local legislature was established, was any encouragement given to colonization. During the Peninsular War, the English merchants and others engaged in the fisheries being relieved from competition with their French and American rivals, enjoyed increasing prosperity, and in one year the exports rose to a value of £2,900,000. Population likewise increased, and in 1834 was estimated at 80,000, in spite of the depression in trade that had ensued upon the return of peace. By 1874 the people had doubled their numbers, being 162,000; and the census recently taken shows over 193,000 inhabitants, an increase at the rate of 20 per cent. during the decade. Immigration is said to have practically ceased for the last fifty years, and to be more than counterbalanced by emigration to the United States. Of the present population, Mr. Justice Pinsent says, there are probably less than 10,000 not belonging to the operative fishery classes. The people are almost wholly of English and Irish descent, with a small, but in wealth and worth a very important and valuable, percentage of Scotch. About three-fifths of the people are Protestants, the remainder being Roman Catholics.

The Governor of Newfoundland is appointed by the Crown, and advised by responsible Ministers chosen from the Legislature,

which consists of a House of Assembly of thirty-three members, and a Legislative Council of fifteen, who are appointed by the Queen on the nomination of the Governor. The revenue is mainly derived from customs dues upon imports, and the public debt is about equal to 30s. a head of the population. One-third of the exports of Newfoundland go to Great Britain, and over one-third of her imports are received from the mother-country. The bulk of the exports consists of oil, fish, and copper ore and regulus, and the imports from Great Britain are chiefly apparel and haberdashery, cotton manufactures, woollens, and iron, wrought and unwrought. According to the census of 1874 there were over 45,000 persons employed in fishing and curing fish; this number has increased by about 10,000; the number of able-bodied fishermen in the colony in 1874 was 26,000; there are now over 30,000.

The capital of the colony, St. John's, contains about 28,000 inhabitants. Situate in the latitude of Paris ( $47^{\circ}33'$ ) and in west longitude  $52^{\circ}45'$ , it is the most eastern port in all America, and is less than 1,650 miles from the coast of Ireland. Containing a dry dock capable of accommodating the largest vessel afloat, and fitted with the best means and appliances for repairs, as well as for loading and unloading, and having an unequalled harbour of refuge, St. John's, it is hoped, will not be overlooked by the Imperial Government when it completes its scheme for defence of the coaling stations.

Railway construction is as yet in its infancy, but an ambitious scheme is in course of development for connecting St. John's with St. George's Bay, on the west coast, whence a line of steamers will be chartered to run to the nearest convenient point of the mainland. By availing themselves of this short line route, future travellers from Europe, whilst reducing their passage of the Atlantic to something under four days, may, and probably will, be induced to make some acquaintance with the beauties of the island and its capabilities for sport. Combining a soil which nearly everywhere can be made a valuable auxiliary to her incomparable fisheries for the support of the people, and the rich metalliferous character of the country being abundantly testified to by scientific men, Newfoundland only waits for the introduction of capital to develop its extensive resources; and will assuredly take high rank amongst other colonies of its size. Mr. Justice Pinsent contends that the British islands possess a climate far more remarkable for fog and cloud and damp than does Newfoundland, and says the main point of difference in favour of the English compared with the Newfoundland climate is that during March and April they (the Newfoundlanders) have practically no spring, no vegetating weather. The cold of winter is

not excessive, and the season is brighter and more cheerful than the English, and very much less severe than the Canadian.

Probably Newfoundland will soon see its interest in entering the Canadian Dominion ; but, whether it does or not, England's oldest colony, the key of the St. Lawrence, the head-quarters of ocean telegraphy, and the most reliable recruiting ground for the Imperial Navy, must never be allowed to sunder herself from the mother-country, from whom she has hitherto received so little assistance, but to whom she has proved so important an outpost.\*

With the sixteenth century intercourse between the mainland of North America and the maritime nations of Europe appears to have commenced. In the year 1500, Gaspar de Cortereal, a Portuguese, having visited Newfoundland, discovered the mouth of the St. Lawrence. Nominally in quest of the north-west passage, Cortereal seems to have made the acquisition of slaves his main object. Landing on the shores of New Brunswick, he named the land *Terra de Labrador* (land of labourers), and having enticed some fifty of the natives on board his vessels he returned and sold them in Portugal. In the following year he renewed his attempt to find the passage to the East Indies, and, probably adopting similar behaviour towards the natives as on his previous voyage, it causes no surprise to learn that he never returned. His brother Miguel, sailing in 1502 in search of him, shared his fate. Their disappearance probably had much to do with the lull that occurred, and for about twenty years there seems to have been no well-considered attempt to renew exploration of the newly discovered shores. In 1524, however, Francis I. of France, then smarting under the loss of the Imperial Crown he had so eagerly striven for, resolved to compete with his rivals in their discoveries in the New World. "Why," he is reported to have said, "should the kings of Spain and Portugal divide all America between them without suffering me to take a share as their brother? I would fain see the article in Adam's will that bequeaths that vast inheritance to them." An expedition was accordingly fitted out, and placed under the command of Giovanni Verrazano, a native of Florence, who succeeded in reaching the coast of North America (34° N. lat.), and is said to have entered a harbour on the shores of Nova Scotia, but to have been deterred by the Indians from landing. At any rate, after an absence of only six months he was safe back at Dieppe. Ten

---

\* McGregor, in his "History of British America," says : "At least for two centuries and a half after its discovery by Cabot, Newfoundland was of more mighty importance to Great Britain than any other colony, and it is doubtful if the British Empire could have risen to its great and superior rank among the nations of the earth if any other power had held possession of Newfoundland."

years later, Francis I. despatched Jacques Cartier, who sailed from St. Malo in 1534, with orders to found a colony "somewhere in the north-west." Passing through the Straits of Belle Isle, Cartier crossed the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and entered a bay on the coast of New Brunswick, which he called, on account of the heat, Chaleur Bay. Landing on the shores of what he describes as an inviting country, though the natives were half-naked savages, living on raw fish and flesh, Cartier took possession of the land in the name of the king of France, setting up a huge cross on the beach with the *fleur de lys* carved upon it. Having prevailed on the chief of the district to entrust his two sons to his care, he returned to France to report progress and to receive further instructions. So pleased was Francis with the description of the new country that he sent Cartier back in the following spring with three well-manned vessels, and full powers to plant colonies wherever he chose. On this second voyage Cartier arrived at the mouth of the St. Lawrence, so named by him in honour of the saint on whose festival day (August 10) he entered it. Sailing up the mighty river, he reached the island now known as the Isle d'Orleans. Here the natives, reassured by the sight of their two fellow-countrymen, flocked on board. Continuing his voyage, Cartier passed the village of Stadaconna, where Quebec now stands, and reached the native town of Hochelaga. His reception by the natives was most friendly, but after a short stay—during which he named a hill overlooking Hochelaga, Mont Real—Cartier descended the river to the mouth of the St. Charles. Here he wintered, and returned to France early in 1536, taking with him ten natives, all of whom died, except one little girl, soon after their arrival in July at St. Malo.

Returning in 1540 with the real intent of establishing a colony, Cartier was at first well received by the natives; when, however, they heard of the death of their chief and his followers, their feelings of kindness gave place to grief and anger. Thus Cartier, whose intercourse with the natives up to this time had indicated him as one likely to effect a settlement amongst them, failed in his attempt, and for nearly sixty years longer Europeans scarcely visited the coasts of the land that had now come to be called Canada, from the native word *kanata*, signifying "a collection of huts" or village.

In 1598, Henri IV. commissioned the Marquis de la Roche to found a new French empire on the western coast of America. The men forming the bulk of this expedition were convicts, and probably the Marquis did wisely in landing them on Sable Island, off the coast of Nova Scotia, and in contenting himself with a brief exploration of the coast itself. Next year, however, a merchant of St. Malo, named Pontgravé, and a naval officer,



De Chauvin (on whom Henri IV. bestowed a commission similar to that given to De la Roche), visited the St. Lawrence and were so convinced of the commercial capabilities of the country watered by it that, De Chauvin dying, Pontgravé returned to France and secured the companionship of Samuel Champlain, and with his aid made a thorough survey of the great water highway. Now colonization commenced in earnest, and early in 1604 De Monts, a Huguenot nobleman, obtained from the French king a grant of all lands in North America from 40° N. to 46° N. (from Pennsylvania to New Brunswick) under the name of Acadia.\* Accompanied by Champlain as his chief adviser, De Monts, after considerable cruising about on the shores of Nova Scotia and the coast of Maine, selected the site of the modern Annapolis and thereon founded a colony under the name of Port Royal. The arrival of some Jesuit missionaries in 1610 at first added strength to the struggling colony, but very shortly proved its destruction. La Saussaye, the chief of the immigrant Jesuits, not agreeing altogether with the leading men at Port Royal, adventured forth in 1613 and founded a colony (St. Saviour) at the mouth of the Penobscot river, on the coast of Maine, thus incurring the wrath and jealousy of the governor of South Virginia.† An English vessel, under the command of Captain Samuel Argal, speedily descended upon the intruding settlers, and St. Saviour ceased to exist. To make his work complete, Captain Argal proceeded against Port Royal and razed it to the ground. Thus commenced the strife between the English and French for territory in North America, which finally resulted in a world-wide struggle between the two nations.

Meanwhile Champlain had started, in 1608, with a few followers on an overland journey through the unknown districts watered by the St. Lawrence, and on July 3 reached Stadaconna. Here he built a fort to which the name of Quebec was given, either then or very shortly afterwards. Champlain found the Algonquin Indians inhabiting the basin of the St. Lawrence engaged in a ceaseless warfare with the neighbouring tribes of the Iroquois, or Five Nations, then occupying the whole of the country to the south-west. In return for the aid he gave the

---

\* This name was afterwards restricted to the present province of Nova Scotia (though the English claimed New Brunswick as included in the title), and the French possessions in North America were designated generally as New France.

† In 1607, Jamestown in South Virginia had been founded by the colonists sent out by the London Company, and the colony had thriven despite adverse circumstances. The Plymouth Company had been unsuccessful with their colony in the same year, and there was no English settlement north of Jamestown strong enough to resent the intrusion of the French.

Algonquins they escorted him up the St. Lawrence to its junction with the Richelieu river (then called the Iroquois), ascending which Champlain discovered Lake Peter, and later the beautiful lake now bearing his name. Further advance was checked by the Iroquois, and Champlain returned first to Port Royal and then to France for supplies and assistance. In 1611 he again arrived on the St. Lawrence and founded the modern city of Montreal, assuming the name which Cartier had already bestowed on the neighbouring hill.

During the next seventeen years Champlain was engaged in continuing his explorations westwards, and with the aid and guidance of his allies, the Algonquins, he discovered the river Ottawa, Lake Nipissing, and the present Georgian Bay forming the eastern side of Lake Huron. Constantly returning to France for supplies and emigrant recruits, Champlain carefully nursed his young colonies, and in 1628 had acquired so considerable a reputation that his defiance of the English commander, Kirke, resulted in that officer leaving Quebec in peace for a whole year. In 1629, however, Kirke returned, and, his squadron sailing up the St. Lawrence, received the surrender of Quebec and of the lesser settlements in Canada. Owing to Champlain's energy and skilful diplomacy the whole of the English conquests in North America—viz., Cape Breton Island, Acadia (Nova Scotia\*), and Canada—were restored to France in 1632 by the treaty of St. Germain; and Champlain, having been appointed "Governor of New France," returned to his old home at Quebec in 1633. Two years later he died, having made his name immortal as the founder of Canada and all its greatness.

When Cromwell became Protector, among other deeds of might he seized the French forts of St. John and Port Royal, and, in the treaty of Westminster, 1655, held Nova Scotia as an English possession. Charles II. surrendered to the French demand for the restoration of Acadia, but in 1690 Sir William Phipps by the capture of Port Royal again acquired the province for the English. By the peace of Ryswick (1697) Nova Scotia was once more restored to France, and Port Royal having been fortified became the resort of freebooters, who, according to the New Englanders, preyed upon Massachusetts commerce. War again breaking out in 1702, after several attacks Port Royal was captured by an English fleet in 1710, and its name changed to Annapolis in honour of the reigning sovereign. At this date Nova Scotia, or Acadia, did not contain 1,000 souls, but, owing

---

\* Nova Scotia acquired its name from having been granted by James I., in 1621, to Sir William Alexander under that title. By Canada may be understood so much of the present Dominion as the French occupied beyond Acadia and Cape Breton Island.

to the attempts then being made to "ring in" the British colonies on the eastern coast of North America by the French settlements on the St. Lawrence and the Mississippi rivers, it was determined to hold Nova Scotia permanently, and Annapolis received a garrison. Though by the treaty of Utrecht (1713) the English were confirmed in the possession of Nova Scotia, the French were allowed to retain Cape Breton Island, which, with its formidable fortress of Louisbourg, became a standing threat to the English colonies in North America.

By the treaty of Utrecht it was expressly provided that such of the French inhabitants of Acadia as were willing to remain subject to Great Britain should enjoy free exercise of their religion, but that any who wished to remove with their effects might do so within a year. Very few availed themselves of the latter privilege, and at the end of the year those who remained were required to take the oath of allegiance to King George. Doubtless, in course of time, they would have done so, but the French authorities in Canada and Cape Breton Island employed agents to keep them hostile to England, and to hinder their taking the oath. For seventeen years the English authorities showed patience and forbearance ; then, in 1730, "nearly all the inhabitants signed by crosses, since few of them could write, an oath recognizing George II. as sovereign of Acadia, and promising fidelity and obedience to him. This restored comparative quiet till the war of 1745, when some of the Acadians remained neutral, while some took arms against the English, and many others aided the enemy with information and supplies." \*

The English concentrated their strength for an attack upon Louisbourg, and 4,000 colonial troops under the command of William Pepperel, aided by a few English vessels under Admiral Warren, besieged the fortress from April 30 to June 16, when its capture was accomplished. The booty was immense, and, to increase it, the French flag was kept flying, so that vessels from France entered the harbour to become the spoil of the victors. It is said that the share of a seaman before the mast amounted to 800 guineas ! The French endeavoured to revenge themselves, but failed alike in their attacks upon Annapolis and upon Boston.

By the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle (1748), Cape Breton was again restored to the French, but this unstatesmanlike surrender had one good result—viz., the founding of the city of Halifax. Owing to the French making Louisbourg more formidable than ever,

---

\* "Montcalm and Wolfe." By Francis Parkman. Vol. i. p. 91. Macmillan & Co.

the British Ministry resolved to establish another station as a counterpoise; and the harbour of Chebucto, on the south coast of Acadia, was chosen as the site of it. Thither, in June, 1749, came a fleet of transports loaded with emigrants, tempted by offers of land and a home in the New World. Some were mechanics, tradesmen, farmers, and labourers; others were sailors, soldiers, and subaltern officers, thrown out of employment by the peace. Including women and children, they counted in all about 2,500. Alone, of all the British colonies on the continent, this new settlement was the offspring, not of private enterprise, but of royal authority. Yet it was free like the rest, with the same popular representation and local self-government. . . . Before summer was over the streets were laid out and the building-plot of each settler was assigned to him; before winter closed the whole were under shelter, the village was fenced with palisades and defended by redoubts of timber, and the battalions lately in garrison at Louisbourg manned the wooden ramparts. Succeeding years brought more emigrants, till, in 1752, the population was above 4,000. Thus was born into the world the city of Halifax.\*

During the next three years there was a constant struggle going on between the English and French as to the boundaries of Acadia. The difficulty was largely increased by the refractory conduct of the French Acadians, who still hoped that they might again fall under the rule of the French, and whose conduct was directed and their hostility fomented by the Frenchmen ruling in Cape Breton Island and Isle St. Jean (now Prince Edward Island). In 1755, there being open warfare between the English and French in North America, affairs came to a climax, and Governor Lawrence wrote to the Lords of Trade that he was determined "to bring the inhabitants to a compliance or rid the province of such perfidious subjects." The Acadians were finally summoned to take an oath of fidelity and allegiance to King George II. and his successors under penalty of leaving the country. Deputies representing nine-tenths of the Acadian population flatly refused to take the oath, and the Council sitting at Halifax "resolved to distribute them among the various English colonies, and to hire vessels for the purpose with all despatch."†

Mr. Parkman, who has gone thoroughly into the question of the deportation of the Acadians, about which so much misapprehension exists, ascribes the rejection of the oath,

partly to a fixed belief that the English would not execute their threats, partly to ties of race and kin, but mainly to superstition. They feared to take part with heretics against the king of France, whose cause, as already stated, they had been taught to regard as one with the cause of God; they were constrained by the dread of perdition.‡

\* "Montcalm and Wolfe," vol. i. p. 93. † *Ibid.* p. 265. ‡ *Ibid.*

[Vol. CXXIV. No. CCXLVII.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LXVIII. No. I. G

In September, the order was given to seize the able-bodied males; and within two months rather over 6,000 men, women, and children, grouped as far as possible by families and villages, were transported to the colonies from Massachusetts to Georgia. Many of the exiles escaped to Canada, and their fate is said to have been harder than that of those who remained in the English provinces, owing to the comparative poverty of the French colony. Those who may wish to correct any notions formed from a perusal of Longfellow's "Evangeline," cannot better disprove the poet's story than by a study of the historical documents so ably collated and condensed by Mr. Parkman.

After a year of open hostility, England declared war against France in May, 1756, and at first success favoured the French. Montcalm had been chosen to command the troops in North America, and for two years his victories promised well for the French cause. Then, in 1758, came a change in the fortune of war. Pitt, the Great Commoner, came into power, and turned his heartiest efforts towards annihilating French power in America. He first aimed at Louisbourg as a step towards taking Quebec, and in June the siege of the "Dunkirk of America" was commenced by the expedition sent from England, and commanded by General Jeffrey Amherst, destined to be the first Governor-General of Canada under British rule. After a gallant defence, Louisbourg was surrendered on July 27, and, with the two great islands that depended on it (Cape Breton and Isle St. Jean) passed into the custody of Great Britain. Wolfe, who had been the life of the siege, holding the position of Brigadier, was impatient to at once attempt the capture of Quebec, but he had to content himself with destroying the settlements on the Gulf of St. Lawrence and dispersing their inhabitants. To show the fighting power of the disunited, and in some cases distracted, English colonies in North America, we may mention that, in 1758, Pitt called upon them to furnish 20,000 men, and that the provincial assemblies voted men in abundance. Massachusetts especially distinguished herself. As a bright example of what a colony-state, high-spirited, warlike and loyal, could effect towards aiding the parent State against a national foe, we quote a report of Governor Pownall to Pitt in that year.

Massachusetts [he says] has been the frontier and advanced guard of all the colonies against the enemy in Canada, and has always taken the lead in military affairs. In the three past years she has spent on the expeditions of Johnson, Winslow, and Loudoun, £242,356, besides about £45,000 a year to support the Provincial Government, at the same time maintaining a number of forts and garrisons, keeping up scouting parties, and building, equipping, and manning a ship of twenty guns for the service of the King. In the first two months of

the present year, 1758, she made a further military outlay of £172,239. Of all these sums she has received from Parliament [of Great Britain] a reimbursement of only £70,117, and hence she is deep in debt; yet, in addition, she has this year raised, paid, maintained, and clothed 7,000 soldiers placed under the command of General Abercromby, besides above 2,500 serving the King by land or sea; amounting in all to about one in four of her able-bodied men.\*

Such splendid conduct is emphasized by our knowledge that Massachusetts was poor in worldly wealth—

living by fishing, farming, and a trade sorely hampered by the British navigation laws. Her contributions of money and men were not ordained by an absolute king, but made by the voluntary act of a free people. . . . Connecticut made equal sacrifices in the common cause—highly to her honour, for she was little exposed to danger, being covered by the neighbouring provinces; while impoverished New Hampshire put one in three of her able-bodied men into the field.†

The year 1759 stands out as one of the most glorious in British annals. In North America, with which we are now alone concerned, the fall of Quebec, consequent upon the battle on the plains of Abraham, dwarfs the lesser victories of Sir W. Johnson at Fort Niagara, and of General Amherst at Ticonderoga. On September 18—five days after Wolfe's death in the moment of victory—Quebec was surrendered, and Canada virtually became a possession of Great Britain; though it was not until September 8, 1760, that the terms of the capitulation were signed effecting the momentous transfer of Montreal and all Canada to the English.

For three years after the conquest the government of Canada was entrusted to the military chiefs stationed at Quebec, Montreal, and Three Rivers, the headquarters of the three departments into which General Amherst divided the country. By royal proclamation in 1763 a new government, Quebec province, was constituted; Labrador, Anticosti, and the Magdalen Islands were placed under the jurisdiction of Newfoundland; and the islands of St. Jean (Prince Edward Island) and Cape Breton (Ile Royale) were added to the government of Nova Scotia. "General assemblies" were to be summoned by the governors "in such manner and form as was usual in those colonies and provinces which were under the King's immediate government." Owing to the unwillingness of the French-Canadian population to take the test oath, no assembly met in

\* "Montcalm and Wolfe," vol. ii. pp. 84, 85.

† *Ibid.* p. 86.

Quebec, and the province remained in a very unsettled state till 1774. In that year

a system of government was granted to Canada by the express authority of Parliament. This constitution was known as the Quebec Act, and greatly extended the boundaries of the province of Quebec as defined in the proclamation of 1763. On one side the province extended to the frontiers of New England, Pennsylvania, New York province, the Ohio, and the left bank of the Mississippi ; on the other, to the Hudson's Bay Territory. Labrador and the islands annexed to Newfoundland in 1763 were made part of the province of Quebec.\*

Notwithstanding the petition of the British inhabitants of the province, the protests of the English-speaking colonies, and the opposition of Lord Chatham, who stigmatized the Bill as "a most cruel, oppressive, and odious measure, tearing up justice and every good principle by the roots," the new constitution came into force in October, 1774. At the close of 1791—some forty thousand loyalists having left the United States for the territory that remained loyal to Great Britain, the majority of whom either settled in Nova Scotia or founded the province of New Brunswick, while about ten thousand settled in Upper Canada—the constitution of 1774 was revised. Two provinces were established in Canada, and a more liberal system of government was granted. Each province was granted a legislative council and assembly, with power to make laws.

The new constitution soon proved unworkable. Constant conflict between the governors and the representative assemblies begot continual agitation on the part of the people. When the assemblies refused to vote supplies, the governors availed themselves of "the casual and territorial revenues" to become independent of the legislature. No satisfaction was got by appealing to the home Government. Discontent at last grew formidable, and culminated in 1837-8 in rebellion, fortunately shortlived and confined to the upper provinces. Then, as now, the remedy of the home Government was to appoint a high commissioner "to examine and report." Lord Durham was appointed Governor-General, and administered affairs from May to November, 1838. Happily for Canada, he was made of too stern stuff to allow of his acting as a mere clerk where there was need of a controlling and directing spirit. Deeming it necessary to deal summarily with certain British subjects then in custody for complicity in the rebellion, he sentenced them to transportation without a form of trial, and subjected them, and others not in prison, to death in case of their return to the country without permission of the authorities.

---

\* "Parliamentary Procedure and Practice." By J. G. Bourinot. P. 7.

The result of his mission was summed up in an elaborate report presented to Parliament in February, 1839. On the absolute necessity of entrusting the government to the hands of those in whom the representative body had confidence, Lord Durham dwelt most strongly. He also advised that, in return for an adequate civil list, the Crown should give up all its revenues except that derived from land sales; that the independence of the judges should be secured; and that municipal institutions should be established without delay "as a matter of vital importance." After debates in Parliament, and consultation with the authorities in Canada, Mr. Poulett Thomson (afterwards Lord Sydenham) was appointed Governor-General, with the avowed object of carrying out the policy of the Imperial Government. The consent of the colonial authorities having been obtained, Parliament passed a Bill, brought forward by Lord John Russell, "to reunite the provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, and for the government of Canada." The passage of the Union Act of 1840 commenced a new era in the constitutional history of Canada. The old system of restrictive administration had passed away, and the great principle was recognized by British statesmen (thanks to Lord Durham's report) "that the Ministry advising the Governor should possess the confidence of the representatives of the people assembled in Parliament." By 1848 the provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick were in full enjoyment of the system of self-government, and good results were speedily seen in their political and material development. In a few years municipal institutions were in working order in Upper and Lower Canada, and largely relieved the legislature of business more suitably transacted in town and county assemblies. When self-government was entrusted to the provinces the British Government declared they had "no wish to make the provinces the resource for patronage at home;" but they pressed upon the Canadian authorities the necessity of giving permanency and stability to the public service by retaining deserving public officers without reference to a change of administration.

The advantages accruing to Canada from the change in the colonial policy of the Imperial Government are thus set forth by Mr. Bourinot:—

All those measures of reform for which Canadians had been struggling during nearly half a century, were at last granted. The control of the public revenues and the civil list had been a matter of serious dispute for years between the colonies and the parent State; but, six years after the union, the legislature obtained complete authority over the civil list, with the sanction of the Imperial Government, which gave up every claim to dispose of provincial moneys.



About the same time the Imperial Government conceded to Canada the full control of the Post Office, in accordance with the wishes of the people as expressed in the legislature. The last tariff framed by the Imperial Parliament for the British possessions in North America was mentioned in the speech at the opening of the legislature in 1842, and not long after that time Canada found herself, as well as the other provinces, completely free from Imperial interference in all matters affecting trade and commerce. In 1846, the British colonies in America were authorized by an Imperial statute to reduce or repeal by their own legislation duties imposed by Imperial Acts upon foreign goods imported from foreign countries into the colonies in question. Canada soon availed herself of this privilege, which was granted to her as the logical sequence of the free-trade policy of Great Britain, and, from that time to the present, she has been enabled to legislate very freely with regard to her own commercial interests.\*

Gradually, however, the administration of government in Canada became surrounded with political difficulties of some perplexity. The French Canadians had all along regarded the scheme of 1840 as intended to Anglicize their province in the course of time. In 1839 Lord Durham had estimated the population of Upper Canada at 400,000, and that of Lower Canada at 600,000, of whom 450,000 were French. By the Union Act of 1840, Upper and Lower Canada had been assigned an equal number of representatives in the united legislature. This was regarded by the more numerous Lower Canadians as a grievance. As, however, population increased more rapidly in the Upper province, owing to the large and continuous immigration that followed upon the Union, a demand sprang up on the part of the Upper Canadians that representation should follow population. To this the Lower Canadians naturally objected.

Parties at last were so equally balanced, on account of the antagonism between the two sections, that the vote of one member might decide the fate of an administration. . . . From May 21, 1862, to the end of June, 1864, there were no less than five different ministries in charge of public business. . . . It was at this critical juncture of affairs the leaders of the government and opposition, in the session of 1864, came to a mutual understanding, after the most mature consideration of the whole question. A coalition government was formed on the basis of a federal union of all the British American provinces, or of the two Canadas, in case of the failure of the larger scheme.†

The Union of the provinces had been urged with great force by Lord Durham on the ground that

it would enable the provinces to co-operate for all common purposes, and above all it would form a great and powerful people, possessing the

---

\* "Parliamentary Procedure," p. 35.

† *Ibid.* pp. 40, 41.

means of securing good and responsible government for itself, and which, under the protection of the British Empire, might, in some measure, counterbalance the preponderant and increasing influence of the United States on the American continent.\*

It happened that at the time of the political deadlock in Canada the maritime provinces were considering a plan of union, and were thus prepossessed in favour of the larger plan suggested to them by the Canadian statesmen. A conference was summoned of delegates from all the British North American provinces, and met at Quebec on October 10, 1864.† After deliberations extending over eighteen days, seventy-two resolutions were agreed to, and formed the basis of the Act of Union. Early in 1865 the Canadian legislature approved the resolutions, but in New Brunswick two general elections took place, in 1865 and 1866, before the legislature followed the example of the Canadian. After months of hesitation, the legislature of Nova Scotia agreed to the union in view of the facts that it was strongly approved by the Imperial Government as in the interests of the Empire, that both Canada and New Brunswick had given their consent, and that it was proposed to make such changes in the terms as would be more favourable to the interests of the maritime provinces. Finally, the scheme of union was submitted to the Imperial Parliament, where it was cordially approved by statesmen of both parties, and passed without amendment, the Royal assent being given on March 29, 1867. The new constitution came into force on July 1, and the first parliament of the united provinces met in November of the same year. In view of the hesitation now witnessed on the part of certain of the colonies of Australasia to enter into a confederation similar to that of the Canadian provinces, it is worth while pointing out that the Dominion of Canada was not achieved in a hurry; that ample deliberation was indulged in before the various provinces made up their minds to a policy of "give and take;" and, what is most to be observed, that the result of the confederation has, in every respect, more than justified the hopes and efforts of those who laboured to effect its consummation.

The Canadian Dominion, as constituted by the Act of 1867, consisted of the provinces of Ontario (Upper Canada), Quebec (Lower Canada), and the maritime provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Provision was made for the admission of other

---

\* Report, p. 116.

† Canada was represented by 12 delegates, 6 for each province; New Brunswick by 7, Nova Scotia by 5, Prince Edward Island by 7, and Newfoundland by 2; each province had a vote, and the Convention sat with closed doors.

colonies on addresses from the parliament of Canada, and from the respective legislatures of Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island, and British Columbia. The acquisition of the North-West Territory had long been desired by the people of Canada, and in 1868 negotiations took place between Canadian delegates and the Hudson's Bay Company for the surrender of the North-West to the Dominion. An agreement was arrived at, involving the payment of £300,000 to the Company, and the Territory, with a certain reservation, was transferred to the rule of the Dominion. In the session of 1870, the Canadian parliament passed an Act to provide for the government of Manitoba, a new province formed out of the North-West Territory, and in 1871 the legislature of Manitoba was elected, and a provincial government was established.

In 1871, in accordance with addresses from the Canadian parliament and the legislative council of British Columbia, that colony was formally admitted into the confederation. The terms of union provided for representation in the Senate and House of Commons, and for the construction of a trans-continental railway. Two years later, the legislature of Prince Edward Island passed the necessary address for admission to the Dominion; and, by an Imperial Order in Council, passed on July 31, 1880, declaring that all British territories and possessions in North America, with the exception of the colony of Newfoundland and its dependencies, should become and form part of Canada, the Dominion received the finishing touch to its present shape and extent.

The Dominion of Canada, occupying the northern half of the continent of North America, has a territory almost equal in extent to Europe, and larger than that of the United States without Alaska.\* Excluding the areas of the great waters, such as the lakes of the upper provinces and the bays and arms of the sea in the maritime provinces, which may be estimated at 140,000 square miles, the territorial area and the population of the Dominion are apportioned among the following provinces and territories :—

Provinces.	Area in square miles.	Persons in 1871.	Persons in 1881.	Increase. Numerical.	Per cent.
Prince Edward Island.	2,133 ...	94,021 ...	108,891 ...	14,870 ...	15·8
Nova Scotia . . . .	20,907 ...	387,800 ...	440,572 ...	52,772 ...	13·6
New Brunswick . . .	27,174 ...	285,594 ...	321,233 ...	35,639 ...	12·5
Quebec . . . . .	188,688 ...	1,191,516 ...	1,859,027 ...	167,511 ...	14
Ontario . . . . .	181,800 ...	1,620,851 ...	1,923,228 ...	302,377 ...	18·6
Manitoba . . . . .	123,200 ...	18,995 ...	65,954 ...	46,959 ...	247·2
British Columbia . .	341,305 ...	86,247 ...	49,459 ...	13,212 ...	36·4
The Territories . . .	2,585,000 ...	52,000 ...	56,446 ...	4,446 ...	8·5
Total . . . . .	3,470,257 ...	3,687,024 ...	4,324,810 ...	637,786 ...	17·3

\* The area of Europe is 3,900,000 square miles; that of the United States is 2,933,588 square miles; and of Alaska, 577,390 square miles.

Of the total population numbered at the census of 1881, 2,188,854 were males and 2,135,956 were females, showing a majority of over 50,000 males. In Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, and the Territories, the two sexes balanced one another. In Ontario, British Columbia, Manitoba, and New Brunswick, the males were more numerous than the females by 30,000, 10,000, 9,000, and 7,000 respectively, while in Quebec alone were the males outnumbered by the females by rather less than 3,000. Excluding the Territories, the whole Dominion shows an increase in population of over 18 per cent. in the ten years from 1871 to 1881. In 1871 there were 20 cities and towns of 5,000 inhabitants and upwards, with a total population of 430,000. In 1881, the number of such cities and towns had increased to 37, having a total population of 660,000. The following are the six most populous cities and towns of the Dominion :—

Names.	Provinces.	Population.		Increase.		Population in 1884.
		1871.	1881.	Numerical.	Per cent.	
Montreal . .	Quebec . .	107,225	140,747	33,522	31·21	200,000
Toronto . .	Ontario . .	56,092	86,415	30,323	54·05	102,000
Quebec . .	Quebec . .	59,699	62,446	2,747	4·60	65,000
Hamilton . .	Ontario . .	26,716	35,961	9,245	34·60	42,000
Halifax . .	Nova Scotia	29,582	36,100	6,518	22·03	40,000
Winnipeg . .	Manitoba . .	241	7,985	7,744	3213·27	30,000

The population of Montreal owes its apparent enormous increase since 1881 to the incorporation of Hochelaga (40,000) with it in that year. The unprecedented increase in the population of Winnipeg promises to make that city one of the most populous in the world, provided that its rate of increase continues for a few years longer. It is satisfactory to note that the more purely British province of Ontario maintains the lead in population. Of the 37 cities and towns exceeding 5,000 inhabitants, 19 are in Ontario and 10 in Quebec province.

From the following table, taken from the census abstract of 1881, will be seen the disposition of the various races that form the population of the Dominion :—

## ORIGINS OF THE PEOPLE.

Provinces.	British.		Irish.	French.	German and Dutch.	Indian.
	English and Welsh.	Scotch.				
Pr. Edward Isl.	21,568	48,933	25,415	10,751	1,368	281
Nova Scotia . .	131,383	146,027	66,067	40,141	42,101	2,125
New Brunswick .	94,861	49,829	101,284	56,685	10,683	1,401
Quebec . . . .	81,866	54,923	123,749	1,075,130	8,409	7,615
Ontario . . . .	542,232	378,536	627,262	102,743	210,557	15,325
Manitoba . . . .	11,606	16,506	10,173	9,949	9,158	6,767
British Columbia	7,596	3,892	3,172	916	952	25,661
The Territories .	1,375	1,217	281	2,896	33	49,472
	891,248	699,853	951,403	1,298,929	284,731	108,547
						84,089

The English and Welsh, and Scotch, make up a population of 1,591,111, or rather more than one-third of the whole population. If the Irish are added, the number of those sprung from ancestors

dwelling in the United Kingdom is seen to be 2,542,514, being considerably more than half the whole population. The French by themselves, numbering a million and a quarter, outnumber by four to one the remainder of the inhabitants of Quebec province, and equal the English, Scotch, and Irish in the Territories. In the other provinces, though they form a numerous and important body, they are nowhere predominant. In Ontario are found over 200,000 Germans and Dutch out of their whole number of 284,000. Half of the Indians are found in the Territories, and rather more than one-fourth of them in British Columbia. The English and Welsh are mostly found in Ontario, but are outnumbered by the Irish, who also predominate in New Brunswick, while the Scotch are most numerous in Prince Edward Island (forming half the population), in Nova Scotia (one-third the population), and in Manitoba. Under "Other Origins" are classed 20,000 Africans (almost entirely found in Ontario and Nova Scotia), 5,000 Scandinavians, 4,500 Swiss, and 4,383 Chinese (4,350 of them being returned for British Columbia). The gross total of the population is made up by 48,500 people whose origins are not given.

The following table, taken from the census abstract of 1881, shows the relative proportion borne by each province to the whole Dominion in respect of area and population :—

Provinces.	Proportion, per cent.		Persons to Sq. Mile.	Acres to a Person.	Acres of Unoccu- pied Land to a Person.
	Acres.	Persons.			
Prince Edward Isl..	·06	2·51	51·0	12·5	2·2
Nova Scotia. . .	·60	10·18	21·0	30·3	18·1
New Brunswick .	·78	7·42	11·8	54·1	42·2
Quebec . . . .	5·44	31·42	7·2	88·8	79·5
Ontario . . . .	2·93	44·47	18·9	33·8	23·8
Manitoba . . .	3·55	1·52	·53	1,195·5	1,159·3
British Columbia .	9·83	1·14	·14	4,456·9	4,409·5
The Territories .	76·80	1·30	·02	30,219·3	30,213·7
Total . . . .	99·99	99·96	1·24	513·5	503·0

Prince Edward Island, by far the smallest of the provinces, is seen to be the most densely populated, containing 51 people for every square mile of its area ; while the Territories are so sparsely populated as to possess nearly 50 square miles for every inhabitant. Nova Scotia and Ontario are the only other provinces that can be said to be populated at all in proportion to their extent, the former having 21 people to the square mile, and the latter only 18·9. For the sake of comparison we ap-

pend a table showing in order of density of population the four divisions of the United Kingdom and the Canadian provinces :—

	Area in Square Miles.	Population in 1881.	Persons per Square Mile
England . . . .	50,823	24,613,926	484
Wales . . . .	7,363	1,860,513	184
Ireland . . . .	32,531	5,174,836	160
Scotland . . . .	29,820	3,735,573	125
Prince Edward Island . .	2,133	108,891	51
Nova Scotia . . . .	20,907	440,572	21
Ontario . . . .	181,800	1,923,228	18
New Brunswick . . . .	27,174	321,233	11
Quebec . . . .	188,688	1,359,027	7
Manitoba . . . .	123,200	65,954	↓
British Columbia . . . .	341,305	49,459	↓
The Territories . . . .	2,665,252	56,446	↓

The whole area of the United Kingdom, comprising 120,832 square miles, has on the average 290 people to a square mile. The whole area of the Dominion has five people to ever four square miles.

The number of owners and occupiers, the extent of their holdings, and the condition of the lands occupied, are seen from the following table, which is compiled from the abstract of Dominion census of 1881 :—

Total Population. 4,324,810	Occupiers of Lands. 464,025	Owners. 403,491	Tenants. 57,245	Employés. 3,289
Occupiers of 10 acres and under. 75,286	Acres. Of 11 to 50. 93,325	Acres. Of 51 to 100. 156,672	Acres. Of 101 to 200. 102,243	Acres. Of 200 and over. 36,499
Total acres occupied. 45,358,141	Total improved. 21,899,181	Under crops. 15,112,284	Pasture. 6,885,562	Gardens and Orchards. 401,335

For the purpose of showing the advance made by the manufacturing and industrial enterprises of the Dominion, we append the following Table of Industries in which *two million dollars* and upwards were invested when the last census was taken, omitting 000's in columns 1, 3, 4, 6 :—

Industries.	1881.			1871.		
	Capital Invested.	Hands Employed.	Annual Value of Products.	Capital Invested.	Hands Employed.	Annual Value of Products.
	\$		\$	\$		\$
Agricultural Implements . . . . .	3,995	3,656	4,405	1,104	2,546	2,685
Bakeries of all sorts . . . . .	2,509	3,963	9,476	1,054	2,664	6,942
Blacksmithing . . . . .	3,056	12,451	7,172	1,720	10,213	8,384
Boots and Shoes . . . . .	6,491	18,949	17,895	3,266	18,719	16,133
Breweries . . . . .	4,592	1,411	4,768	1,666	918	2,141
Cabinet and Furniture . . . . .	3,943	5,857	5,471	2,030	4,366	3,580
Carriage-making . . . . .	3,798	8,713	6,579	1,859	7,798	4,849
Cotton Factories . . . . .	3,476	3,527	3,759	632	745	781
Flour and Grist Mills . . . . .	13,857	6,472	41,772	9,929	4,992	39,135
Foundries, &c. . . . .	7,675	7,789	8,863	3,760	7,653	7,325
Gas-works . . . . .	5,358	512	1,173	2,480	299	750
Iron-smelting Furnaces and } Steel-making . . . . .	2,172	974	1,197	492	624	298
Paper Manufactories . . . . .	2,237	1,520	2,446	610	760	1,071
Printing Offices . . . . .	4,291	5,311	4,742	2,168	3,497	3,420
Saw Mills . . . . .	25,487	2,085	38,541	16,040	35,691	30,256
Sugar Refineries . . . . .	2,150	723	9,627	425	359	4,132
Tailors and Clothiers . . . . .	5,719	18,029	15,102	1,721	11,092	9,345
Tanneries . . . . .	6,386	5,491	15,144	2,656	4,207	9,184
Wool Cloth-making . . . . .	5,272	6,877	8,113	2,776	4,453	5,507

The table from which the above is extracted enumerates 167 industries, with the following results:—

	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Grand Totals .	166,302	254,935	309,676	77,964	187,942	221,617

The following is a comparative view, by provinces, of capital invested, value of products, and number of employes:—

	Capital Invested.		Value of Products.		Persons Employed.	
	1881.	1871.	1881	1871.	1881.	1871.
	\$	\$	\$	\$		
Prince Edward } Island . . . . .	2,085,776		3,400,208		5,767	
Nova Scotia . . . . .	10,183,060	6,041,966	18,575,326	12,338,105	20,390	15,595
New Brunswick . . . . .	8,425,282	5,976,176	18,512,658	17,367,687	19,922	18,352
Quebec . . . . .	59,216,992	28,071,868	104,662,258	77,205,182	85,673	66,714
Ontario . . . . .	80,950,847	37,874,010	157,989,870	114,706,799	118,308	87,281
Manitoba . . . . .	1,383,331		3,413,026		1,921	
British Columbia . . . . .	2,952,835		2,926,784		2,871	
The Territories . . . . .	104,500		195,938		83	
Totals . . . . .	165,802,623		309,676,068		254,935	

But it is the soil of Canada that offers her the best promise of prosperity in the future as it has done in the past. Her forest lands and her vast prairies must for a long time prove the chief source of attraction to immigrant agriculturists; and upon farming and the exportation of farm produce the Dominion will

long rely as her chief industry. Undoubtedly there is more scientific farming in the "old country," yet there are highly cultivated farms in Canada; and in Ontario there is a school of agriculture connected with a model farm at which scientific and practical agriculture is taught. In Quebec, also, there are model farms; and, as a result, there is already visible a marked improvement in the style of farming in many parts of the country. Hitherto the very fertility of the soil and the favourable character of the climate have tended to encourage farming "in the rough;" in the older provinces, however, this state of things is rapidly giving place to a better. The English farmer who may settle in the older provinces will find a general similarity in work and conditions to those he leaves at home. The products are the same, and the nature of the work little different. Machinery is more used in Canada, with corresponding benefits.

The progress of Canada as a stock-breeding country has been remarkable. Barely twenty years ago the first herd of English thorough-bred shorthorns was imported, little attention previously having been given to stock-raising. Though the experiment has been confined chiefly to the older provinces, the test has been thorough and complete, and now the collection of cattle at the great breeding farms is amongst the most valuable in the world. Not only are there many herds of the best English breeds, but the famous shorthorns actually improve in Canada, and it is stated that at a recent sale in England a three-year-old bull, which fetched the enormous price of three thousand six hundred guineas, was of Canadian breed.

Dairy farming has largely developed of late years, and is rapidly extending its field of labour. In the older provinces the factory system has been introduced for the making of cheese, and "creameries" for the making of butter. Already the Americans recognize that the Canadian cheese is superseding their own in the markets of Great Britain. The growth of the "cheese industry" is seen from the following figures:—

QUANTITY AND VALUE OF CHEESE EXPORTED EACH YEAR ENDING 30TH JUNE.

	1870.	1880.	1883.
Quantity . . . .	5,800,000 lbs.	43,000,000 lbs.	57,600,000 lbs.
Value . . . . .	\$670,000	\$4,000,000	\$6,000,000

Fruit-growing, for home consumption and for exportation, is a very important industry. In Ontario there are vineyards and peach orchards of over fifty acres in extent. Apple orchards are innumerable, and strawberries are raised as a field crop. Plums,



pears, gooseberries, currants and raspberries are everywhere produced in the greatest abundance. Melons and tomatoes ripen in the open air, the latter often being sold cheaper than potatoes.

The forest products of Canada find their way to every quarter of the globe—even to Australia; a strange fact, considering the quality and abundance of the “jarrah” wood of West Australia.

It remains for the future properly to develop the mineral resources of the Dominion. Gold-mines have been worked in Nova Scotia, in Quebec, and largely in British Columbia, where there are yet immense fields to open up. Silver-mines have been worked in Ontario; that at Silver Isle, Thunder Bay, is the richest which has been discovered on the continent. Iron ore is found all over the Dominion, and many mines have been successfully worked. Some of the ores are among the most valuable known. The copper-mines around Lake Superior are said to be the richest in the world. In Nova Scotia and British Columbia there are enormous deposits of coal most happily placed, whether for the supply of vessels on the Atlantic or Pacific seaboard, or as being close to the termini of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Coal is also known to exist over a vast region to the east of the Rocky Mountains. The seams that have been examined have proved to be of great thickness and of excellent quality.

Before concluding this paper we shall add a very brief description of the provinces (in themselves equal in size to European kingdoms) which may prove of interest. We commence with the “maritime provinces”—Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island.

By referring to the map the reader will see that Nova Scotia—the first province of the Dominion to come into the possession of Great Britain—is a peninsula, connected with New Brunswick by a narrow isthmus about 16 miles broad, and separated from Cape Breton Island by the Gut of Canso, about a mile in breadth. Three hundred miles long, and from 80 to 100 miles broad, Nova Scotia has a coast-line of 1,200 miles, abounding in excellent harbours, chief of which is Halifax, the capital of the province, and one of the strongest fortified harbours in the world. One-fifth of the area of the province consists of lakes and rivers, and about half is fit for tillage. The soil is most fertile, excellent harvests of wheat and corn crops being raised, while the produce of the orchards is unsurpassed. Immigrant farmers are much needed to turn to advantage the capabilities of Nova Scotia as a sheep-breeding, dairy-farming, and hop-growing country. The fisheries are so valuable that frequent quarrels arise with the American fishermen who encroach upon them. The coal-mines are deservedly famous; and there is no more valuable iron than that of the province. The sea-borne trade,

and the tonnage of the shipping, have about doubled during the last twenty years. In proportion to population, Nova Scotia has more shipping than any other country, there being registered on December 31, 1883, 3,037 vessels of 541,000 tons, to a population of under half a million souls. The climate is more temperate than that enjoyed by any other part of the Dominion, and the industries pursued by the inhabitants are perhaps more diversified than in any other province.

New Brunswick, in area larger than Holland and Belgium united, is 210 miles in length and 180 miles broad. It is mainly a farming and lumber country; but its fisheries, both coast and river, are very great. Just as Nova Scotia boasts of more shipping, so New Brunswick is said to have the greatest mileage of railway in proportion to its population; and its rivers water every part of the country. The summer is warmer and the winter colder than in England, but the climate is very favourable to agriculture, and fruit and potatoes afford an unusually good return. The province was first permanently settled by the United Empire Loyalists from the United States, who arrived in New Brunswick in 1783, and founded the city of St. John—now the most important city in the province, and unrivalled in its position as a seaport. At different times several small bodies of colonists have arrived from various parts of Europe, alike only in this respect—that they have all prospered in their new home. A body of 182 emigrants from the North of England settled there in 1837, and had to clear the land preparatory to cultivation; yet in the sixth year of their residence they reported in the following terms:—

The climate of New Brunswick agrees well with the constitution of Englishmen; the air is salubrious, and the water as pure and wholesome as any in the world. During the six years of our location there have occurred but two deaths, while there have been thirty-nine births without the presence of medical aid. Six years' experience has convinced us that, notwithstanding the privations to which new settlers are exposed, diligence and perseverance must ensure success.\*

Later bands of colonists have equally prospered, whether English, Irish, or Danes; a large immigration, however, is still required to populate the province—possessing as it does only *eleven* persons to the square mile. In addition to being within a week's voyage of England, New Brunswick is more liberal to settlers in the matter of land grants than any other province in the Dominion, or any State in the Union; and the position

\* "Newfoundland to Manitoba." By W. Fraser Rae. P. 84. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1881.

of New Brunswick as a shipbuilding country is now largely giving place to its manufacturing development ; thus both sustaining its great agricultural industry and encouraging the immigration of farmers. We fully expect to see in the near future a very decided growth both of Nova Scotia and of New Brunswick.

The remaining "maritime province"—Prince Edward Island, named after Edward, Duke of Kent, the Queen's father—lies in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and is separated from the northern shores of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick by the Straits of Northumberland, varying in width from 9 to 15 miles. In the spring, summer, and autumn steamers ply every other day between the island and the mainland, but in the winter the passage is rendered difficult by the ice blocking the Straits. The smallest member of the Dominion (about 2,000 square miles), the island is the best populated, having fifty-one persons to the square mile. Fishing is the chief industry, but excellent crops of oats, potatoes, and buckwheat are raised by a large portion of the population. Charlottetown, the capital, is the largest city in the island ; it has about 12,000 inhabitants, and its admirable position attracts many visitors in the summer months. The fact of the province (with only 110,000 inhabitants) having to maintain its own legislature gives point to the remark that *three separate local legislatures* for only nine hundred thousand people seem to indicate a waste in ruling power ; and it appears probable that the "maritime provinces"—having identical interests—will yet see their advantage in forming a single united provincial legislature ; a union which would add both to their welfare and importance, alike at home and abroad.

Coming now to "old Canada"—Quebec and Ontario provinces—formerly known as Lower (Eastern) and Upper (Western) Canada, we may mention that the first named is most famous as containing the cities of Quebec and Montreal, the oldest in the Dominion, and in both of which the parliaments of the united provinces have been held at different periods in their history.\*

We hope the "fortress-city" is too well known to need praise, but the following sketch is a striking one :—

Quebec will always be remarkable for its historical associations and for the exquisite beauty of its scenery. The traveller, however

---

\* The first parliament of the United Canadas was held at Kingston (Ontario) in 1841. Three years later it was removed to Montreal (then containing 40,000 people). Six years later, in 1849, it was agreed that the legislature should meet alternately in Quebec and Toronto. Finally, the Queen was petitioned to select a permanent capital, and Ottawa was chosen, and, since 1866, parliament has met there.

far he may have rambled, cannot fail to recognize that the view from Durlam Terrace is one of the finest he has ever seen. Some contend that it is unsurpassed. On one side is the citadel in all its strength and grandeur. On the opposite bank of the river, Point Levis stands forth with its coves and buildings, and scenes of stirring life. Immediately below us the majestic river itself flows in a great, placid stream on its way to the ocean. To the north rise the bold heights of the Laurentian range, bearing evidences of life from their base far up on the hill-side. In Quebec one feels that he is on a spot where every foot of space was once of value from the necessity of protecting the whole by works of defence. We are taken back to the European life of insecurity of two centuries ago, when every town was so protected, and yet was often ravaged and despoiled. Quebec is the one memorial of that state of things on this continent.\*

Although Quebec is still the centre of much business activity and of great wealth, and is, besides, the seat of the provincial legislature, the commerce of the city has not grown as rapidly as has that of its rival sister, Montreal. Yet it is only within the last half-century that the commercial advantages possessed by Montreal from its geographical position have been understood and developed. To the remarkable engineering works, extending east and west of the city, is due its commercial supremacy. To the east, a ship canal has been dredged through Lake St. Peter to a depth of 25 feet, to admit of the passage of ocean steamers. The immensity of the work can be understood from the fact that the original depth over the St. Peter flats was 11 feet. This gigantic work, commenced in 1840, has been continued up to the present day. For seventeen miles the excavation extends over shoals irregular in depth. Already \$3,500,000 have been expended on the work. The channel is now being deepened to 27 feet 6 inches, and to this end the shoals of the St. Lawrence itself above and below Lake St. Peter must be dredged. According to Mr. Sandford Fleming there is but one parallel to this work in the world—the improvement of the Clyde, which has been continued for one hundred years. Originally only vessels drawing 3 feet 6 inches could reach Glasgow. At this date ocean steamers of the largest draught are found at the Broomielaw. Hence Glasgow, by artificial means, has become one of the chief ports of the United Kingdom; and similarly Montreal, although *a thousand miles from the ocean*, is one of the most important seaports of the Dominion, and judged by the standard of Customs receipts, may boast to be the first. Under French rule, Montreal had simply a monopoly of trade with the Indians, and was virtually the end of French settlement, having but a small

\* Sandford Fleming: "England and Canada," p. 128.

[Vol. CXXIV. No. CCXLVII.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LXVIII. No. I. H

population. Now Montreal is a city, including its suburbs, of 200,000 inhabitants. Most of the old French landmarks are disappearing, and but little remains to recall French rule. Socially, Montreal bears the impress which wealth, proceeding from a long and prosperous commerce, stamps upon the Transatlantic communities. Palatial residences and highly cultivated grounds are seen on all sides. The main business thoroughfares abound in handsome architectural structures, largely built of the limestone furnished from the neighbouring quarries. Canadians boast that the wharves in front of the city have not their equal on the continent. There is every sign of material success, including "a busy, anxious, enterprising, pushing population, with all the accessories in connection with it which wealth gives."\*

Passing from the chief seat of the commerce of the Dominion to its capital city, it is somewhat surprising that, except during the three or four months when parliament is in session, there should be so little animation in Ottawa. Meeting in January occasionally, but more frequently in February, the Federal Parliament sits till April or May. Comprising about three hundred members in the Senate and the House of Commons† together, the arrival of the legislature at once animates the city. The streets are alive with new faces. Ministers give a series of dinners; and their example is followed by those of the residents whose means will admit of their entertaining. The club is crowded, and the hotels are filled with busy individuals engaged in the multifarious schemes awaiting parliamentary sanction. Few cities are livelier than is Ottawa while the session lasts. With the closing of parliament the capital falls back into its quasi-torpor for the rest of the year. Ottawa is by no means a typical city of Ontario; and it is in Toronto—the "muddy little York" to which the Loyalists were derisively directed to betake themselves in 1783, now the capital of the "premier province"—that one finds the true spirit of Ontario at its best. A political centre of great activity, whence originate plans and

---

\* Sandford Fleming, p. 141.

† By the terms of the Constitution, the Senate consists of 78 senators—namely, 24 from the province of Ontario, 24 from Quebec, 10 from Nova Scotia, 10 from New Brunswick, 4 from Prince Edward Island, 3 from Manitoba, and 3 from British Columbia. Each senator must be thirty years of age, a born or naturalized subject, and possessed of property, real or personal, of the value of 4,000 dollars in the province for which he is appointed. Senators are nominated for life, by summons of the Governor-General under the Great Seal of Canada. The House of Commons of the Dominion is elected by the people, for five years, at the rate of one representative for every 17,000 souls. The constituencies vary in the different provinces, but the suffrage is a very free one. Voting is by ballot.

projects that largely influence Dominion politics, the tone of its intellectual life is higher; and it is generally admitted (save by the citizens of Montreal) that "there is a more assured type of culture and urban refinement by the shores of Lake Ontario than on the island of Montreal."

Half as large again as the United Kingdom, the province of Quebec stretches on both sides of the St. Lawrence—from the Straits of Belle Isle on the north, and Cape Gaspé on the south—to some distance above Montreal; in all, a distance of over a thousand miles. Ontario province, with an area rather larger, reaches the most southern point of the Dominion, and extends to James' Bay and the Albany river on the north, and Manitoba on the north-west. Both in Quebec and Ontario agriculture is the principal occupation of the inhabitants, while "lumbering" and the fisheries are almost equally important. Montreal and Toronto stand far ahead as commercial centres at the present date, but there are several other cities—notably, Hamilton, London, and Kingston—from which rivalry will certainly be experienced in no short time. The climate of the two provinces is so warm in the summer, that maize, tomatoes, and grapes and peaches ripen in the open air; and in winter the cold is sufficiently severe to pack the snow under foot for several months, thus rendering the most valuable service to the soil, and facilitating the means of communication. The eastern townships of Quebec lying south of the St. Lawrence and adjoining the United States, are particularly fertile; and steps are now being taken to bring them prominently before intending emigrant farmers, as it is confidently asserted they are most favourably situated for feeding and fattening stock for the markets of the United Kingdom. In this respect, however, it will be difficult to surpass the province of Manitoba, situated in the very middle of the continent, and only needing population to take its place among the most prosperous of the provinces. All the cereals grow and ripen in abundance. Wheat is especially adapted to the soil and climate, and cattle-raising will soon prove an all-important industry. We have already referred to the extraordinary development of the city of Winnipeg, with over thirty thousand inhabitants, from the old Fort Garry of the Hudson's Bay traders. If, however, the scheme be put into practice for exporting the products of Manitoba and the North-West Territories from Hudson's Bay, by means of the Nelson river and the other great rivers of the North-West, it not only needs no prophet to foretell the continued abnormal growth of Winnipeg, but it will be safe to predict the speedy appearance of other equally important and "Aladdin-like" cities in the farther west. Already four "provisional districts" have been carved out of the great "north-west," of

which the smallest, Assiniboia, comprises 95,000 square miles, and the largest, Athabasca, 122,000 square miles; while the other two districts—Saskatchewan and Alberta—are respectively 114,000 and 100,000 square miles in extent. It is in the district of Assiniboia that the famous "Bell Farm," one hundred square miles in size, has been established, and its continued success alone is needed to ensure its meeting with many imitators. It is set forth on reliable authority\* that there are in the vast North-West 600,000 square miles of valuable agricultural land, well adapted for settlement and cultivation; and that of this vast area considerably more than half is of the most fertile description, and is called properly "the Wheat Land;" and it is computed that these six hundred thousand square miles would sustain in comfort a population of 120,000,000 inhabitants, and that the density of population would then be only what it was in Germany in 1871—viz., 200 persons to a square mile. Even to approach calculations of such magnitude is to bewilder the imagination with the possibilities of wealth and power open to those possessing so magnificent a domain.

There remains but the province of British Columbia. Last, but by no means least, of the provinces, it is difficult to say whether its geographical position, as the western face of the Dominion, or its great natural resources are of the most value. Three hundred and forty thousand square miles in area, with a coast-line of 600 miles, dotted with innumerable bays, harbours, and inlets, and blessed with a climate far less rigorous than that of the rest of the Dominion, British Columbia (save that it is so far distant) offers, perhaps, the greatest attractions to immigrants possessing a few hundred pounds. Abounding in mineral wealth, with vast forest lands of great value, and fisheries surpassed by none, the province greatly needs the introduction of capital and labour. And as likely to afford this necessary means of development, the Canadian Pacific Railway is regarded with the most hopeful expectation. Probably the late war panic will result in the establishment of a naval and military station upon Burrard Inlet, "a consummation devoutly to be wished," both for the material security of so valuable a province, and for the development of its industrial possibilities now lying dormant.

We have now passed in rapid review the various provinces of the Dominion. Each of them has a separate parliament † and administration, with a lieutenant-governor at the head of the

---

\* "The Dominion of Canada." By W.J. Patterson. P. 30. Montreal. 1883.

† Ontario, Manitoba, and British Columbia have legislative assemblies only; while the other provinces have each a legislative council and an assembly.

executive, and each has full powers to regulate its own local affairs, dispose of its own revenues, and enact such laws as it may deem best for its own internal welfare, provided only it does not interfere with, or prove adverse to, the action and policy of the central administration under the Governor-General. The fact that, although over 6,000 Acts were passed by the provincial legislatures between 1867 and 1882, only *thirty-one* altogether were disallowed by the Federal Government, proves that the veto has been sparingly used, and that in numerous cases the local legislatures must have shown themselves amenable to the remonstrances of the law officers of the Crown.

There is no State Church in the whole of British North America. Except in British Columbia, all the provinces have one or more universities and several colleges which prepare for university degrees. In all the provinces, Government has more or less supervision over education. The poor and middle classes can send their children to free schools, where excellent education is given; and the road to the colleges and higher education is open and easy for all.

Throughout the Dominion a perfect system of municipal institutions prevails. Both the counties and townships have local councils to regulate their taxes for roads, schools, and other purposes.

The militia force of Canada is entirely composed of volunteers; and the mobility of the system has received ample justification in the speedy success which has attended the suppression of the recent rising in the North-West.

The postal system extends to every hamlet and village in the land, no matter how remote; the number of letters and post-cards delivered in 1883 amounted to over seventy-five millions.

Containing about five million souls, British North America already equals Ireland in population, and its present rapid increase promises that by the close of the century it will equal that of Scotland and Ireland united. Who can guess what numbers it will reach by the middle of the next century? Probably it will fall little short, if at all, of the present population of these islands.

A Dominion of four million square miles, inhabited by five millions of people, with resources such as we have seen Canada possesses, cannot be dealt with satisfactorily in a few pages—and the length of this paper has perhaps unduly extended itself. We hope, however, that its purpose—namely, to summarize the information possessed of the history and circumstances of British North America—has been achieved, and that we shall be able to deal with our Australian and African Colonies in later numbers of this REVIEW.



## ART. VI.—DOGMA IN MASQUERADE.

*Natural Law in the Spiritual World.* By HENRY DRUMMOND, F.R.S.E., F.G.S. Fourteenth Edition, completing Thirty-fourth Thousand. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1884.

WHEN a work professing to reconcile theology with science passes through fourteen editions in two years, it may plausibly be assumed that religious people are somewhat anxious to see such a reconciliation effected; and when, further, such a book is extensively eulogized by religious critics and the religious public, as original, impressive, thoughtful, and convincing, it seems reasonable to suppose that it presents some of the ablest reasoning in support of theology at present forthcoming from Christian men of science. Mr. Drummond's book, then, is entitled to serious attention from all who hesitate to aspire to the bad eminence of Gallio.

It is not meant by this to suggest that the silence maintained in the scientific camp as to Mr. Drummond's book signifies indifference to his thesis: to tell the truth, Mr. Drummond is somewhat dexterous in his avoidance of propositions which it would be in the scientific man's way to contravene; just as he avoids attracting the attention of the Biblical critic proper. He enters into no argument on behalf of miracles in general or Christian miracles in particular: he says practically nothing about the old questions of the world's age, or the flood, or design. On the contrary, he starts with the unqualified assumption that the Bible is a special revelation from a Supreme Being. "We do not demand of Nature," he says in his Introduction (p. 10), "directly to prove religion. That was never its function. Its function is to interpret." Here, perhaps, the scientist might open his eyes, and ask whether it is meant that Nature was created for the exegesis of Scripture, but he is strictly not concerned with the proposition. "Revelation," says Mr. Drummond again (p. 33), "never volunteers anything that man could discover for himself—on the principle, probably, that it is only when he is capable of discovering it that he is capable of appreciating it." This last-quoted sentence seems to be one of those "particularly fine things" which a time-honoured apophthegm counsels young authors to sacrifice. On the face of it, it implies two propositions, uncommonly awkward for Mr. Drummond; first, that there is no historical corroboration of the Biblical narrative; second, that men are incapable of appreciating what is revealed to them. Mr. Drummond does

say some very unfortunate things explicitly ; but he can hardly have meant this. His views as to the position of revelation, however, may be further inferred from yet another passage in his chapter on Biogenesis (p. 73) : "The right of the spiritual world to speak of its own phenomena is as secure as the right of the natural world to speak of itself. What is science but what the natural world has said to natural men? What is revelation but what the spiritual world has said to spiritual men?" It will be seen that Mr. Drummond is a very ingenious analogist. Some of us would modestly say that science is a body of conclusions that men—genus *homo*—have arrived at from a study of Nature, which said extremely little to them until they cross-examined it ; that "revelation" is something which some men have alleged ; and that the spiritual world and spiritual men are, like "the chronometer of God," names in grievous need of a definition. And Mr. Drummond does simply nothing to supply the need : from first to last he gives us no definition whatever. But how neat is his mock analogy ; how engagingly confident his intimation ; and how extremely handy his formula for the large and respectable class which has scruples about doing its own thinking ! It is evident that the criticism of such a writer is not specially the work of the practical scientist, any more than of the historical inquirer. Properly it should fall to the orthodox theologian, and the present study, unfortunately, cannot pretend to be in the theological spirit. It is, however, very much at the service of the genuine functionary, if he is disposed, as in duty bound, to emulate its purpose. What has to be done with a writer of Mr. Drummond's unique description is to take him on his own ground and estimate his reasonings by the canons of universal logic.

Mr. Drummond is nothing if not systematic, and he ought to be systematically discussed ; to which end a brief preliminary account of the object of his book is desirable. Briefly, then, he professes to take the leading doctrines of Christian theology and show that they are not merely analogous to and in harmony with the leading doctrines of natural science, but identical with these doctrines ; that what we call natural law is found to extend through the so-called spiritual world ; that, in other words, Christian theology can be shown to be substantiated in detail by the generalizations of physical science. The complete position is that revelation cannot be proved or disproved by science or reasoning, but that, for those who accept it to start with, its truth may be made more clear by showing that theology is not the chaos it seemed to be even to the believing eye, but is identical with the body of scientific law.

The author begins by telling us that it has for years been his

privilege to lecture to a class on the natural sciences on weekdays, and to lecture to working-men on morals and religion on Sundays. For a time, he tells us, he kept the two departments entirely separate in his mind, and on this head he expresses no sense of shame. After a while, however, he found that his modes of thinking had, without his being conscious of it, undergone a change. "I discovered myself," are his words, "enunciating spiritual law in the exact terms of biology and physics" (Preface, p. vii.). So that Mr. Drummond would appear to have taught religion and morals to the working-classes, for a time, by a process of unconscious cerebration. What he began in this manner, however, he proceeded to do of set purpose; and he became convinced that whereas his "spiritual world before was a chaos of facts" and his "theology a Pythagorean system trying to make the best of phenomena apart from the idea of law," he could now arrange his theological creed on the basis of his scientific beliefs. That is to say, he did not look about for spiritual phenomena as men of science look into Nature; he took the theological formulæ of spiritual law, and proceeded to state them in terms of natural laws. This interesting literary exercise he holds to be on a par with Mr. Spencer's application of natural law to sociology; and he claims to be essentially original in his achievement. Some writers, as he points out (p. 13), had said there could be no application of natural laws of cause and effect to religion; Mr. Horace Bushnell authoritatively describing the "spiritual world" as "another system of Nature incommunicably separate from ours." Analogies between "spiritual" and natural phenomena had always been recognized; but, says Mr. Drummond, the analogies of natural and spiritual law had been overlooked; hence the dread of science noticeable in theology. It was not that the theologian dreaded scientific fact. "No single fact in science," Mr. Drummond tranquilly observes in passing (p. 30), "has ever discredited a fact in religion." It was simply that science had a method, a system, a reign of law; whereas theology had none, and was apprehensive and jealous accordingly—an account of the matter which it is for theologians to discuss. But henceforth things are to be different. "It will be the splendid task of the theology of the future," Mr. Drummond announces (p. 52), "to . . . disclose to a waning scepticism the naturalness of the supernatural." This is another of Mr. Drummond's "particularly fine things;" and a rigorous reader may incline to say that if the author be only allowed rope enough of that description he will anticipate critical justice. But the rigorous reader is apt to forget that the people who have purchased 34,000 copies of Mr. Drummond's book are for the most part not given to judicial methods of study. A very little logic enables

one to perceive that to assert "the naturalness of the supernatural" is to say there is no supernatural; and that Mr. Drummond virtually undertakes to strengthen the belief in the supernatural by showing the supernatural is not supernatural. But it is safe to say that Mr. Drummond's friendly readers, from the *Spectator* downwards, will never have their equanimity jeopardized by logical sensitiveness to such trifles as that. And that kind of reader is not likely to be disturbed when Mr. Drummond, almost immediately after declaring that it will be a "splendid task" for theology to show that the supernatural is natural, protests (p. 54) that "there is nothing so especially exalted . . . in the natural laws in themselves as to make one anxious to find them blood relations of the spiritual;" and that (p. 55) "their dignity is not as natural laws, but as spiritual laws." Mr. Drummond evidently holds with Emerson, that "with consistency a great soul has simply nothing to do." His versatility of view is not less conspicuous than his fertility in aphorism.

To be scrupulously fair, we may note that there is one passage in the Introduction which might be argued to indicate a scientific reason for believing in the spiritual. It is less noteworthy in that regard, however, than as showing how Mr. Drummond reasons. He professes to take up the thesis of the work entitled "The Unseen Universe," which is that the universe whose phenomena we see has been developed from forms of matter we cannot cognise; and that it must again pass into "unseen" forms. Mr. Drummond (p. 54) puts it thus: "There is a point of time when the energy of the universe must come to an end; and that which has its end in time cannot be infinite, it must also have had a beginning in time. Hence the unseen existed before the seen." Now, on Mr. Drummond's own showing, the writers of "The Unseen Universe" do nothing to explain how an infinite universe can ever aggregate; or how an aggregated universe can be said to have parted with all its energy so long as it coheres; or how the dead mass, as they call it, is going to disappear. But the interesting point is that two pages further on (see also p. 53) the doctrine of the unseen existing before the seen is transformed by Mr. Drummond into the doctrine of "the priority of the spiritual." The authors of "The Unseen Universe" had not pretended that the unseen ought to be called the spiritual. They represented it as a hypothetical unknown form of matter, which might have come from another unknown form. That is Mr. Drummond's scientific basis for his spiritual world.

On such methods as these, it will be generally allowed, the demonstration of an identity between natural and spiritual laws, or between any existence and any non-existence, is not such an

arduous undertaking as it would otherwise appear; but it is highly improbable that any mind, however speculative, would anticipate the manner in which Mr. Drummond accomplishes his task. He professes, indeed, in his Introduction, to make good his case in a single sentence, making, for the purpose, an extremely original application of the law of continuity, and an equally original application of the syllogism. "As the natural laws are continuous through the universe of matter and of space," he tells us (p. 41), "so will they be continuous through the universe of spirit." And then he asks, with an exquisiteness of logical simplicity which it is hardly too much to call genius: "If this be denied, what then? *Those who deny it must furnish the disproof.* The argument is founded on a principle *which is now acknowledged to be universal*, and the *onus* of disproof must be with those who may be bold enough to take up the position *that a region exists where at last the principle of continuity fails.*" That is a flower of formulated nonsense, which logicians will not willingly let die. Altering the terms, but retaining the formula, we get such a proposition as this: "Those who do not believe in spiritualism say that intangible spirits cannot play banjos. But it is universally acknowledged that banjos cannot be played save by living beings, and the *onus* of disproof must lie with those who are bold enough to say that those who sound banjos are not living intelligences." We modestly assure Mr. Drummond that we never said there was a spiritual "region" where continuity ceases—our nearest approach to such a concept being our sensations in trying to follow some of his arguments—but that nevertheless we consider his proposition to amount to precisely nothing. The versatile author would, perhaps, say that his proposition here was only addressed to those theologians who assert a "spiritual world," while denying that its laws are those of the natural world. But in that case why proceed, after declaring that the *onus* of disproof lies with the opposing theologian, to supply some 400 pages of proof?

The truth is, Mr. Drummond has experienced, at least for a short time, an uneasy sense that there is something wrong about his exposition of the law of continuity. He grapples with the difficulty as follows:—

It may seem an obvious objection that many of the natural laws have no connection whatever with the spiritual world. . . . Gravitation, for instance—what direct application has that in the spiritual world? The reply is threefold. First, *there is no proof that it does not hold there* (!). If the spirit be in any sense material, it certainly must hold. In the second place, gravitation may hold for the spiritual sphere, although it cannot be directly proved. The spirit may be

armed with powers which enable it to rise superior to gravity. During the action of these powers gravity *need be no more suspended than in the case of a plant which rises in the air during the process of growth*. It does this in virtue of a higher law, *and in apparent defiance of the lower*. Thirdly, if the spirit be not material, it still cannot be said that gravitation ceases at that point to be continuous. It is not gravitation that ceases—it is matter.

There is so much “meat and drink” in this sort of thing for the critical mind that it may be permitted to carry the quotation further:—

This point, however, will require development for another reason. In the case of the plant just referred to, there is a principle of growth or vitality at work *superseding the attraction of gravity*. Why is there no trace of that law in the inorganic world? Is not this another instance of the discontinuousness of law? If the law of vitality has so little connection with the inorganic kingdom—*less even than gravitation with the spiritual*—what becomes of continuity? Is it not evident that each kingdom of nature has its own set of laws, which continue possibly untouched for the specific kingdom but never extend beyond it?

It is quite true that when we pass from the inorganic to the organic, we come upon a new set of laws. But the reason why the lower set do not seem to act in the higher sphere is not that they are annihilated, but that they are overruled. And the reason why the higher laws are not found operating in the lower is not because they are not continuous downwards, but because there is nothing for them there to act upon. It is not law that fails, but opportunity. The biological laws are continuous for life. Wherever there is life, that is to say, they will be found acting, just as gravitation acts wherever there is matter.

For a teacher of physical science that is tolerably funny, but a still higher point is reached in the next paragraph:—

*We have purposely in the last paragraph indulged in a fallacy. We have said that the biological laws would certainly be continuous in the lower or mineral sphere were there anything there for them to act upon. Now laws do not act upon anything. It has been stated already, though apparently it cannot be too abundantly emphasized (!), that laws are only modes of operation, not themselves operators. The accurate statement, therefore, would be that the biological laws would be continuous in the lower sphere, were there anything there for them, not to act upon, but to keep in order. If there is no acting going on, if there is nothing being kept in order, the responsibility does not lie with continuity. The law will always be at its post, not only when its services are required, but wherever they are possible.*

It is difficult to take seriously a passage which reads so very much like an extract from “Alice in Wonderland;” but when a

book containing such writing can be pronounced "calm, judicial, scholarly," by such a journal as *Knowledge*; when the writer can be congratulated on the "accuracy of his view of law" by such an authority as the *Spectator*; and when the *Nonconformist* and the *Guardian* vie with each other and with the daily press in equivalent praise, it really becomes necessary to say a serious word. It seems needful to remind these guides of public opinion that "natural law" is simply the term for an observed constancy of relation between given phenomena; and that to talk of such relation "keeping things in order" and being "at its post" when its "services are required," is to use language of an absurdity not easily to be paralleled. The last-quoted paragraph, with its mock rectification of the fallacy in the preceding, is fully the more ridiculous of the two; and it leaves a rational reader with no conclusion open to him save that the author is hopelessly incapable of comprehending philosophic language. That he should cap his first absurdity by professing to have introduced it intentionally, and then thrice confounding confusion by his "accurate statement," is intelligible on no other view. The only possible theory seems to be that some friend had seen the first blunder before the book was compiled, and had gently indicated to Mr. Drummond that he was writing rather portentous nonsense; whereupon the versatile author introduced a paragraph to say that he had been fallacious on purpose—the purpose being left to the reader's imagination—and proceeded to put matters right, according to his lights. But as Mr. Drummond really could not see through his own fallacy, his mind being a sort of fallacy machine, he simply restated it in other and worse words; whereupon his friend, if further consulted, decided to leave Mr. Drummond to his fate. Our author is not one of those who would "speak disrespectfully of the equator;" he probably reveres it for being so constantly "at its post." In the next paragraph he goes on in a delightful way to remark that "a hasty glance at the present argument on the part of any one *ill-furnished enough to confound law with substance or with cause*, would probably lead to its immediate rejection." To which it may be replied that a hasty glance on anybody's part would lead to the conclusion that Mr. Drummond confounded law with function and energy; and that the most leisurely reading would fail to induce repentance.

After he has got through the jungle of his Introduction, Mr. Drummond's first step is to lay down the scientific doctrine of Biogenesis, or the derivation of life from life, and to show how that corresponds with Christian theology. And at the very outset of the chapter on Biogenesis we have a sample of scientific exposition which gives cause to suspect that the writer has worse

faults than incompetence. He tells the well-known story of Dr. Bastian's attempts to prove spontaneous generation; how Professor Tyndall showed that Bastian's experiments must have been faulty; and how the Professor came to the conclusion that "no shred of trustworthy *experimental testimony* exists to prove that life *in our day* has ever appeared independently of antecedent life." This we all knew. But Mr. Drummond would feel himself falling below his task if he did not get more out of a scientific proposition than ordinary eyes can see in it; and so, after referring to the experiments of Mr. Dallinger, who showed the almost indestructible vitality (Mr. Drummond drops the "almost") of some of the lower forms of life, he presents us (p. 63, also p. 79) with this summing-up:—"These experiments have practically closed the question. A decided and authoritative conclusion has now taken its place in science. So far as science can settle anything, this question is settled. The attempt to get the living out of the dead has failed. Spontaneous generation has had to be given up." And all through his book Mr. Drummond continues thus to imply that it has been scientifically proved that the living could never have arisen from the non-living. It would be difficult to imagine a more scandalous misrepresentation, supposing the perversion to be deliberate, or a more discreditable misconception, supposing it to result from a defect of intelligence. All that has really been done in the matter of spontaneous generation thus far is to rebut the assertion that life can come from non-life *in the present condition of things on this globe*. To say that "spontaneous generation has had to be given up"—in the full sense of that phrase—is to say that the evolution theory is admittedly incapable of completion. So far from giving up the hypothesis of spontaneous generation, science will never, can never rest until that hypothesis is transformed into a body of proof. The law of continuity, on which Mr. Drummond so ingenuously professes to found his case, is incomplete until spontaneous generation is placed on a basis of certitude. Mr. Drummond himself tells us that the law of continuity is now universally acknowledged. That is practically the case, as regards the history of life on the globe, because the difficulty about the first appearance is the only serious breach. But if it were scientifically decided that life could *not* evolve from non-life—the organic from the inorganic—the law of continuity would be broken down. And Mr. Drummond, in representing that spontaneous generation can never have happened, is taking the ground from under his own feet before he has made a single step. He not only misrepresents what science teaches; he goes the length of implying that science assumes miracle. "Of that strange borderland between the dead and



the living," he observes (p. 69), "science is silent. It is as if God had placed everything in earth and heaven in the hands of Nature, but reserved a point at the genesis of life for His direct appearing." And on p. 76 we have: "In either case, the first step in peopling these worlds [natural and "spiritual"] with the appropriate living forms is virtually miracle." And the man who writes thus professes to accept the law of continuity, and to base his theology on science!

It might be thought that, after such a stroke as this, Mr. Drummond would have gone a little way with some wariness, and without so openly playing fast and loose with fact and logic. But the next step in his argument is, if possible, more outrageous still. The analogy\* he proceeds to draw between natural and spiritual law, in regard to Biogenesis, is this: That whereas life can only come from life in the natural world, so in the "spiritual world" life can only come from Jesus Christ. The law of Biogenesis, according to Mr. Drummond (pp. 71-74), is spiritually formulated in these two texts: "Except a man be born again . . . except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God." "He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." It must be clearly understood that our author literally asserts believing Christians to be spiritually alive, and all other human beings spiritually dead. A tolerably enlightened reader is apt to miss Mr. Drummond's meaning by taking his language on this head to be metaphorical, but there can be no dispute as to its precise and literal quality. The distinction between the best of men who do not believe in Christ and those who do, we are told (p. 81), "is the same as that between the organic and the inorganic, the living and the dead." "The difference," it is laid down again (p. 82), "between the spiritual man and the natural man is not a difference of development but of generation. It is a distinction of quality, not of quantity. A man cannot rise by any natural development from 'morality touched by emotion' to 'morality touched by life.'" Again we have (p. 130): "The Christian . . . like the poet, is born, not made." "The spiritual man . . . is a new creation born from above" (p. 65). "This life comes suddenly" (p. 93). So the argument is explicit, that as life could only arise on the earth by a supernatural act—by the direct interposition of God, so spiritual life can only arise in a man's personality by the interposition of Jesus. See now, how this compares with the

---

\* Mr. Drummond says (p. 76), "between laws there is no analogy; there is continuity;" but he explains that he uses the term "analogy" at times for convenience.

scientific doctrine of Biogenesis. That simply asserts that *at present* life comes from life—organism from organism. Science knows nothing whatever of a creation of life by miracle. That is Theogenesis—a conception not within the range of science as the word is at present understood. What Mr. Drummond does is to take the scientific doctrine of Biogenesis, tack on to it the lawless dogma of Theogenesis, and then proceed to allege that the scientific generalization is identical with a theological dogma which asserts nothing whatever that is even remotely comparable to Biogenesis, but a perpetually repeated Theogenesis—an incalculable series of miracles. If it were asserted that Christians produced Christians, that spiritual life went from father or mother to son and daughter—that would indeed be a sort of analogy to Biogenesis. If spiritual life were alleged to be hereditary, like insanity, or even if it were communicable from one person to another, it might be pretended that it conformed to the law of Biogenesis. But when the reasoner contends in the most explicit terms that this is not so, but that each Christian gets his spiritual life, suddenly and miraculously, direct from the Deity, we can but say that we have not found such audacity—no, not in Israel. What he has done is to falsify biology at the outset of his exposition, to impose upon it a theological doctrine of catastrophism, and then to pretend that is analogous or identical with a so-called spiritual process which is not even comparable to a process of Biogenesis from a catastrophic beginning, but is catastrophic at every step! Of course, *c'est le premier pas qui coûte*; but the undertaking of Saint Denis was modest beside that of Mr. Drummond. The saint's experiment barely involved a double miracle: Mr. Drummond's involves at least three. With him you have to assume first a miracle of Theogenesis; next, an endless series of miracles of spiritual Theogenesis; and in the act you introduce the miracle of the incarnation of Deity in the person of Jesus. That is how we make a beginning in the process of showing that theology is identical with scientific law: we have only to adopt three miracle concepts and to turn science out of doors.

And Mr. Drummond's progress is worthy of his beginning. The chapter on Biogenesis is followed by one on Degeneration, in which it is sought to show that the phenomena of degeneration in natural life are directly analogous to those of degeneration in spiritual life. We got in the previous chapter, by a process of exclusion, a negative knowledge of what Mr. Drummond regards as the spiritual life—that it is not the intellectual or moral life in the ordinary sense of these phrases, but a special and peculiar life, set up only in the souls of orthodox Christians, by the miraculous action of Deity.

Seeing, then, that in his second chapter our author declares all men to have souls, he is in the picturesque position of asserting that many men have souls which are not spiritually alive. Not being spiritually alive, it might be presumed they are naturally alive; but then natural life, in the terms of Mr. Drummond's exposition, is the life of organisms, and no theology alleges that the soul is an organism. So that Mr. Drummond must be understood to assert three kinds of life: the spiritual life—that of the true Christian; the natural life—that which he has in common with all organisms; and a third kind of life—that of the non-Christian soul, which is neither one nor the other, though it would appear to go on in the spiritual world. If, however, we are to trace natural law in the spiritual world in regard to the process of degeneration, it must be by exhibiting degeneration in the spiritual life proper. Yet, incredible as it may seem, Mr. Drummond does not attempt to show that there is any such thing. What he does in this chapter is to show a species of what he calls degeneration in the cases of men who have, on his own definition, never had the spiritual life at all. The only phenomena suggestive of spiritual degeneration to which he calls our attention, occur among those whom he himself describes as the spiritually dead. Taking as an illustration the tendency of the domestic pigeon, when allowed to go wild in a wild region, to revert to the original plain and ungraceful type of rock-pigeon, Mr. Drummond intimates (p. 98) in his unsophisticated terminology, that

the natural law by which such a change occurs is called *the principle of reversion to type*. "Now," he explains (p. 98), "the same thing exactly would happen to you or me. . . . If a man neglect himself for a few years he will change into a worse man and a lower man. If it is his body that he neglects, he will deteriorate into a wild and bestial savage. . . . If it is his mind, it will degenerate into imbecility and madness. . . . If he neglect his conscience, it will run off into lawlessness and vice. Or lastly, if it is his soul, it must inevitably atrophy, drop off in ruin and decay."

So that it would appear (see also p. 100) a man's soul may be dead before his body. But the main point to be noticed in this new system of psychology, with its divisions of soul, mind, and conscience, is that Mr. Drummond is dealing solely with degeneration in the unspiritual man, who, he himself told us, is to the spiritual man what the inorganic is to the organic. Describing the case of a man who has neglected his soul till it dies, he says: "Instead of aspiring to conversion to a higher type, he submits by a law of Nature to reversion to a lower. This is degeneration." If the phrase about conversion to a

higher type counts for anything in the argument, it implies that a single pigeon may by aspiration rise to a higher type, or go through the entire process of reversion to the prior. It seems as likely as not that Mr. Drummond believes in the occurrence of such transformations, but however that may be, the degeneration he speaks of, on his own showing, is not degeneration in the spiritual life. The man instanced had, *ex hypothesi*, never reached spiritual life: he was to the spiritually alive "as the inorganic to the organic." In point of fact he is denounced because, being inorganic, he did not become organic by aspiration; yet all the while he is credited with the remarkable feat of degenerating from a condition of spiritual non-existence to one of death of the soul, whatever that may be. So that what we get by the second chapter is an annihilation of the ground taken up in the first; which, in its turn, annihilated the ground taken up in the Introduction. The demonstration of natural law in the spiritual world, it will be seen, resembles nothing so much as the record of a celebrated minus quantity in the fauna of Iceland.

Of course the process of destroying all that went before cannot well be carried on unremittingly through the remaining chapters of the book, on Growth, Death, Mortification, Eternal Life, Environment, Conformity to Type, Semi-Parasitism, Parasitism, and Classification. The chapter on Growth is an amplification of that on Biogenesis—the old thesis being returned to now that it is convenient to do so. The doctrine now is that growth has two characteristics, spontaneousness and mysteriousness. You do not try to grow; you simply feed and live properly, and you grow. So with your soul after it has become spiritually alive. Christians, Mr. Drummond tells us, are constantly making themselves uncomfortable in the attempt to grow spiritually, whereas all they have to do is to let themselves grow. To bring out his meaning, he restates his temporarily discarded doctrine of the miraculous character of the spiritual life.

Grant for a moment [he says, p. 131] that by hard work and self-restraint a man may attain to a very high character. It is not denied that this can be done. But what is denied is that this is growth, and that this process is Christianity. *The fact that you can account for it proves that it is not growth.* For growth is mysterious; *the peculiarity of it is that you cannot account for it.*

Lest any misconceive the force of the last clause, be it explained that Mr. Drummond has exhibited the "accuracy of his view of law," which so impresses the *Spectator*, by the intimation (p. 86) that "*the doctrines of conservation and transformation of energy . . . do not hold for vitality.*" Vitality,

then, being subject to no physical laws, and growth even in organisms being a miracle, "the problem of the Christian life finally is simplified to this—man has but to preserve the right attitude" (p. 140). But why "preserve?" If Mr. Drummond had adhered all along to the position of his chapter on Biogenesis he would have had to argue that by getting into the wrong attitude the Christian might degenerate; but Mr. Drummond's purpose is to show that Calvinistic theology is scientific; and that theology teaches that degeneration is not possible to the believing Christian. The doctrines of election and of the perseverance of the saints are to the effect that as men are saved by God's free grace, so they cannot fall away from grace. That being so, it is impossible for the Christian to get into the wrong "attitude." It would appear to be easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for Mr. Drummond to make an approach to proving his case in a single detail—or to formulate a decently logical argument, for that matter.

Passing from the chapter on Growth to that on Death, we find that as in his third chapter Mr. Drummond returns to the deserted position of his first, so in his fourth he reverts to that of his second. This versatility is the prominent feature of his method; and all that a rival theologian would have to do would be to set one chapter against another, and make Mr. Drummond refute himself. To expose Mr. Drummond's perversions of science there is needed only the most ordinary knowledge of the generalizations of science; but to refute his argument as a whole there is required no knowledge of science whatever. A comparison of chapters is sufficient. The chapter on Death is an amplification of the previous three-card trick of degeneration. If it was to do anything whatever to fulfil the promise of the Introduction, it ought to show that the spiritual life is affected by death just as the natural life is. But just as the pretended degeneration in the spiritual world was on Mr. Drummond's own showing a degeneration from spiritual unbornness to another death, so the pretended death in the spiritual world is on his own showing the death of the already spiritually dead. He takes (p. 147) Mr. Spencer's definition of life as "the continuous adjustment of internal relations to external relations," and he proceeds to apply it. And here he does seem for a moment to realize the chaos into which he has manipulated his argument; and he proceeds hastily to show that death is a relative term. The bird, he ingeniously reasons, has a wider environment than the plant; the man a wider than the bird; and as the plant is practically dead to a large part of the bird's environment, so the bird is dead to a large part of the man's. And so, further, a man may be dead to the spiritual environment, by which Mr. Drum-

mond means Deity. An instructed reader will turn away from this sort of thing with a yawn; but to the reader who is in that condition of popular enlightenment in which writers in the *Spectator* and in *Knowledge* contemplate such reasoning with respect, it is well to point out in so many words that the argument before us is a piece of ridiculous sophistry. To call the plant dead to the bird's environment, or the bird to the man's, is not to use the language of science at all. Death in the natural world is the *cessation* of a mode of life; and on Mr. Drummond's principle spiritual death should be the cessation of spiritual life. But he has committed himself to the proposition that the natural man is spiritually dead to start with; that is, he is, compared with the Christian, as the inorganic to the organic. Since, then, Mr. Drummond's theology pledges him to the doctrine that the spiritually living soul, at least, cannot die, the only conclusion he can present to us is that a man who, not knowing God to begin with, does not keep up his communion with God, will die spiritually—that the spiritually dead man, if he does not take care, will spiritually die over again. "You may dwarf a soul," the author says (p. 173), "just as you can dwarf a plant, by depriving it of a full environment;" and this dwarfing, we are informed by our accurate doctor of law, is "to science" an "instance of arrested development; and to religion it presents the spectacle of a corpse—a living death." Which means, according to the argument, that a bird is "to science" an instance of arrested development, and is a corpse, in that it is not a man; and that every organism is dwarfed and dead, in that its environment is limited.

The courage with which Mr Drummond disposes of his difficulties is no less remarkable than the facility with which he multiplies them. On page 11, he tells us that "it is the want of the discerning faculty, the clairvoyant power of seeing the eternal in the temporal; rather than the failure of the reason, that begets (*sic*) the sceptic." This explanation he is good enough to repeat. The endeavours of well-meaning Christians to show that the agnostic really does know what he denies, our philosopher tells us (pp. 78, 160), are quite misplaced. The natural man cannot know the things of the Spirit of God. The agnostic is "blind and deaf, dumb, torpid, and dead to the spiritual world." But it is rather obvious that if the agnostic cannot help himself, there is little use in seeking to convert him; and to the common sense in these days there is apt to be something revolting in denunciation of the blind because they cannot see; so that at one stage of his argument, Mr. Drummond—possibly himself perceiving dimly the singular nature of his creed—virtuously protests (p. 105) that "*there is an affectation that religious truths lie beyond the sphere of the comprehension which*

serves men in ordinary things"—what he calls an affectation being simply his own distinct and repeatedly declared doctrine. "Such harmonies are in" theological souls.

The candid reader will not deny the entertaining quality of all this, but it is too much to expect that his interest will continue without flagging to the end. Even absurdity palls, and it must suffice to take a comprehensive glance at the remainder of Mr Drummond's exposition, though the sets of propositions above noticed are profusely elaborated as the book goes on, and the chapter on Mortification embraces even a more picturesque series of feats in logical sleight-of-hand than any of those preceding it. The new-born Christian—the spiritually-alive man—we are told (p. 179) passes at the moment of his spiritual birth into a new environment; whereupon there ensues a conflict of the two environments. The old "competes doggedly (!) with the new environment for a share of the correspondence (!)" and it is the business of the Christian to cut himself off from the old environment. Before, we were told that he had only to maintain the right attitude; now we learn that he has to make, as it were, a variety of medical and surgical operations on himself. Mr. Drummond formulates the amended doctrine thus (p. 182):—

The methods by which the spiritual man is to withdraw himself from the old environment, or from the part of it which will directly hinder the spiritual life, are three in number—

First, Suicide.

Second, Mortification.

Third, Limitation.

To the eye of mere human reason, the analogue of natural suicide in the spiritual life would be a voluntary destruction of his spiritual life by the spiritually-alive man; but of course, on the theological premises, there can be no such thing; and what Mr. Drummond gives us as the analogous phenomenon is a process of dying to sin, by entirely leaving the sinful environment. As if renunciation of any section of his environment by a human being were scientifically definable as suicide. But the absolute emptiness of the doctrine becomes more apparent when we find that the sinful environment is simply what every well-meaning man shuns, even when, in the language of Mr. Drummond, he is spiritually dead. He is to control his temper and avoid drunkenness—just to do what Mr. Drummond admits any spiritually dead man may do. And this is spiritual suicide—not even, as before, killing the dead man, but killing the vices that even the dead man is able to kill. And so with mortification. Analogically, spiritual mortification would be death of part of the soul; but as Mr. Drummond describes it, it is the mere abstinence from a parti-

cular vice—that is, a perfectly natural process, not a spiritual one at all. Here, indeed, it might be pretended that natural and spiritual are identical; but the identity is made out by simply calling the natural spiritual. So, again, with limitation. Spiritual limitation—a sufficiently fatuous term—is not a limiting of a spiritual function at all, but a gradual abstinence from morally unhealthy function—such an abstinence as is daily effected by the man whom Mr. Drummond calls spiritually dead. So that spiritual suicide, spiritual mortification, and spiritual limitation are one and the same thing—mere avoidance of vice! We have simply the snakes of Iceland over again in every chapter; and for purposes of description the book might be condensed on the old model: “Chapter I. Concerning Biogenesis. There is no Biogenesis in the spiritual world, only Theogenesis.” “Chapter II. Concerning Degeneration. There is no degeneration in the spiritual life, but there is degeneration in a kind of life which is spiritual death.” “Concerning Death. The man who has spiritual life cannot die; but dead men do die in the spiritual world.”

The absurdities of the book are combined, consummated, and crowned in the chapter on Eternal Life. Mr. Drummond quotes (p. 203) Mr. Spencer’s observation that “perfect correspondence would be perfect life,” and then goes on to argue in his diffuse way that in the spiritual world eternal life—that is, not merely endless life, but the highest and fullest life—is attained by the spiritual individual attaining to perfect correspondence with God. It is again necessary to obtrude a piece of elementary scientific information on a world enlightened by the *Spectator* and *Knowledge*—the intimation, namely, that in the natural world there is no such thing as perfect correspondence existing or conceivable. Mr. Drummond himself has some dim perception of this. As he puts it in his special dialect (p. 103): “One cannot say it is natural for a plant to live. Examine its nature fully, and you have to admit that its natural tendency is to die.” So be it; but how then about natural law in the spiritual world, where there is no cessation of spiritual life? Again, it is even as with the ophidia of Iceland.

It is usually remarked by instructed people, when they have been induced to read this ridiculous book, that it is not worth serious answer; and indeed its imbecilities, when analyzed, do seem too abject for discussion. But there is a serious side to the phenomenon. It is not merely that the trumpeting of the book by prominent journalistic guides of public opinion, the demand for it among orthodox readers, and the acclamations bestowed by them on Mr. Drummond—who has been welcomed as a lecturer at the Edinburgh Philosophical Institution on the strength of



his book—it is not merely that all this conveys a grievous impression of the average standard of culture and intelligence in the nation. There is a more serious consideration still—the fact, namely, that after setting aside the whole medley of fallacy and contradiction which constitutes Mr. Drummond's reconciliation of religion and science, we find remaining a theory of morals which is morbid and pernicious beyond description. Instead of seeing in natural science the refutation of the monstrous morality of Calvinism, with its systematic reading of the lessons of life backwards, he reads Calvinism into Nature, as thus (p. 105): "We have looked round the wards of a hospital, a prison, or a madhouse, and seen there Nature at work *squaring her accounts with sin.*" That is to say, if a gale blows down a tile from a roof so that it strikes and maims some one, the injury is a punishment for sin. If a man be thrown from his horse, and so have his brain injured and become insane, his insanity is a punishment for sin. Or if a man be born with homicidal mania and obey his overwhelming impulse, he is to be regarded as a voluntary offender. If that be not meant, Mr. Drummond's sentence means nothing. And this Calvinistic superstition runs through his talk about science till the frightful passes into the purely grotesque. Thus we are told of the *crustacea* of the Mammoth Cave of Kentucky (p. 114) that they "*have chosen to abide in darkness.*" Therefore they have become fitted for it. By refusing to see they have waived the right to see. *And Nature has grimly humoured them. Nature had to do it by her very constitution.*" But the very sublimity of the absurd is reached in the chapters on Parasitism and Semi-Parasitism, where we are told (p. 319) that parasitism is "one of the gravest crimes in Nature," and—highest flight of all—"a breach of the law of evolution!" Is it necessary, or is it of any use, to proclaim on the house-top that parasitism is evolution? that evolution is simply the process of life, of which parasitism is a feature? that the life of the parasite is as perfectly natural as that of any other organism whatever? that the parasite is no more "punished," or subjected to suffering, than any other creature? How is it that these *bêtises* can come from Scotland, the land of logic—whence also of late comes the teaching, through the Duke of Argyll, that all other animals differ from man in having no vices, nor any habits analogous to vices? Is it that every attempt to reconcile theology with science must collapse in absurdity?

Enough of the nonsense; but let our last word on this book be a protest against its execrable ethics. If we are to revert to the theology which burned heretics while declaring that God foreordained they should be heretics; if we are to adopt the

psychology which chained and scourged the madman ; if we are to embrace the morality which declared the leper accursed, and deprived him of his possessions ; if we are to return to the moral darkness of Calvinism and the ages of faith—then we may adopt Mr. Drummond's figment of natural law in a theological world, and bolster up myth with dogma, lawless premiss with lawless conclusion, degrading reason to the level of a beast of burden for superstition. But if there is a nobler fate in store for men, this latest emanation of chaos will pass to the limbo of all insanities.

---

### ART. VII.—THE WEAKNESS OF RUSSIA.

1. *Russia under the Tzars.* By S. STEPNIAK, Author of "Underground Russia;" translated by WILLIAM WESTALL, Author of "Red Ryvington," &c. Two vols. London : Ward & Downey. 1885.
2. *Studies in Russia.* By AUGUSTUS J. C. HARE, Author of "Walks in Rome," "Cities in Northern and Central Italy," "Wanderings in Spain," &c. London : Smith, Elder & Co. 1885.

"RUSSIA," according to M. Stepniak, "is passing through a crisis of great importance in her social and political life. . . . Everybody feels in his heart, if he does not speak it aloud, that momentous changes are pending, and that Russia is on the eve of great events.\* Hitherto, however," he says, "the European public have seldom if ever heard the views of those who, being most interested in the question, are naturally the most competent to give an opinion—the Russians themselves ; for it would be as perilous for an educated Russian to reveal that mystery of iniquity—the Russian Government—as openly to attack the Tzar in the presence of his police."

The Administration have absolute control of the press, which in their hands does not tend to the enlightenment of public opinion. The task of speaking for the party opposed to the Government which, according to M. Stepniak, is identical with "the whole of educated Russia," falls to the extreme section of the Opposition. This task is undertaken as a duty by M. Stepniak. "A Nihilist writer—a practical Nihilist, as some English newspapers [to use his own words] have been good enough to call me, a man whose sole claim to the indulgence

---

\* Preface, pp. iii., iv.

of the English public is the authorship of a book,\* having for its object the explanation and defence of Nihilism, a claim which is far from being the most efficient for such a work as mine."†

We may remark that we do not know whether M. Stepniak would assent to the definition of Nihilism taken by Mr. Hare from St. Augustine, *Nihilisti appellantur quia nihil credunt et nihil docent.*‡ M. Stepniak, an exile from Russia on account of his political creed, is aware that his statements are therefore likely to be thought by his readers exaggerations.

Knowing beforehand [he says] the points as to which my readers are most likely to be most distrustful, I resolved above all things to avoid exaggeration, and I have aimed throughout at saying too little rather than too much. . . . Yet I neither intend nor desire to put the existing régime in any better light than it deserves. Not at all: though I "nothing set down in malice," I "nothing extenuate." I tell only the plain, unvarnished truth, but it is the full truth. In the selection of my facts I have taken the greatest care, rejecting everything that seemed without warrant or not altogether trustworthy.§

Feeling the distrust which M. Stepniak anticipated in his readers we turned to the "Studies" of Mr. Hare. Though not a brilliant he is a very careful and accurate writer, and we find the historical portions of M. Stepniak's book, and his general description of the government and people of Russia, abundantly confirmed by the authorities quoted by Mr. Hare. Confirmation of M. Stepniak's concrete and personal statements as to the iniquities of the Russian Government are not to be looked for in Mr. Hare's book. He himself tells us: "A foreigner must spend two years in our country before he can judge of it, say the Russians, and the author of the following chapters feels bound to confess at the outset he has only passed one summer there."|| One of his experiences is noteworthy, as it shows the old Russian hatred of strangers, though it may be mitigated, yet exists. In his preface, referring to the woodcuts which illustrate his work, he says: "His sketches were taken upon the spot, under the fear, almost the certainty, of arrest, and sometimes of imprisonment, till the rare official could be found who was capable of reading the various permits with which he was furnished."¶ Elsewhere he corroborates M. Stepniak as to the universal corruption of Russian officials. He speaks of their general expectation of a bribe and their habit of receiving it.

\* M. Stepniak's "Underground Russia."

† "Studies in Russia," p. 5, note.

‡ "Studies in Russia," Preface, p. vii.

¶ Preface, p. viii. conf. "Studies," p. 3.

† *Ibid.* pp. v., vi.

§ Preface, p. vi.

This is his experience of the dangers of sketching in Russia—on one occasion he was detained at a place called Brest:—

Most wretched [he says] was the almost fœtid station, yet the broad so-called "streets" of the miserable town outside were more than a foot deep in sand, or mud, like a ploughed field after months of rain. Here [he continues] merely for want of something to do, the writer began to sketch a shed and a willow-tree. Instantly two soldiers pounced out from the bushes, behind which they had been following him, seized him, and he was marched off to the guard-room, where a ridiculous little officer put him through all the absurd official catechism of his age, birthplace, names and ages of parents, objects in coming to Russia, object in being at Brest, and, above all, object in sketching that particular shed and willow-tree. Had he a passport? Why was it not in his pocket? If it really existed and was at the station, he must be sent to fetch it; and in the burning sun he was marched back through the mud to bring it. Meanwhile, the sketch-book containing the obnoxious drawing was confiscated, though when the prisoner was led back to the guard-room, he instantly espied it abandoned on a stool, sat down upon it, and whilst his second cross-examination was going on, under shadow of the passport, contrived to slip it up his back under his coat, and, when he was at length released, carried it off in safety. By this time five hours had been spent or wasted.\*

With regard to the instances and details of the cruelties and the iniquities of the Russian administration, "it is evident," says M. Stepniak, "that they can seldom be openly mentioned in the *censured* press,† and then only in guarded and evasive language." He has therefore resorted to other and trustworthy sources. "Many of my statements [he adds] are drawn either from my own personal experience or from the experience of friends who have been good enough to place them at my disposal. I have merely put their narratives into literary shape."‡ A careful examination of our author's statements leads us to believe that they possess the characteristics of "moderation and sobriety" which he claims for them. In form his book, he admits, is "irregular and not strictly didactic."§ And we think we shall best do justice to his work if we, in the first instance, briefly sketch the rise of the government of the Tzars and the modifications through which it has taken its present form, and then call attention to its cruelties and iniquities.

---

\* "Studies," pp. 483, 484.

† By this awkward phrase, often used by the translator, we presume is meant "the press—subject to the revision of the official censor."

‡ Preface, p. viii.

§ *Ibid.* pp. viii., ix. At p. vii., it is said that "the six chapters of the second volume," first appeared in the *Times*. There are ten chapters in the second volume, and we cannot identify the six which appeared in the *Times*.

In the history and social conditions of the country must be sought, according to M. Stepniak, the causes to which the autocracy of Russia owes its being. An observant and accurate writer describes the first impression made on him by a visit to Russia, in terms which we cannot hope to improve, and therefore transcribe :—

On taking a retrospect of our short experience of Russia, two things struck us very forcibly. In the first place, the resemblance between it and America—that is, in its modern progressive and society phase. In the second, the resemblance between it and the Oriental nations in its ancient or ethnological phase. In the extent of its country, for instance, in the new growth of its civilization; in the seeming eccentricities or exuberances of the social life in the cities; in the hospitable and unaffected manners of its people, Russia came very close indeed to what we had seen in America. On the other hand, in a certain Tatar type of face often met with throughout the country, in certain domestic customs and habits of everyday life, in the ceremonial of its religion, and in the blind submission to the sovereign power, it seemed to be formed in Oriental mould.\*

Those who say that “the Russian people have an instinctive preference for despotic government makè [according to M. Stepniak] a great mistake.”† Ancient Russia was a group of republics—“primitive states, elementary in their institutions and purely democratic in their government.”‡ There were princes or rulers, who reigned but did not govern; they were elected by the people and obedient to their will. By traditional custom they were chosen from generation to generation from among the members of the same family, but the principle of hereditary descent was not indefectible, and when a prince lost the affections of the people they changed him for one more to their liking. Whence the proverb, “An evil prince to the mud of the marsh.” “Changes like these were of frequent occurrence, and there were few princes who had not occupied in the course of their lives half a dozen thrones or ‘dinner tables,’ according to the suggestive phrase then in vogue.”§

All legislative and executive power was vested in a popular assembly called the *Vetche*, and composed of free citizens without distinction of rank or fortune. “The people were supreme. Every citizen had an equal voice in the government of the country, and neither the ruling prince nor any other public functionary had a vested interest in his place. The *Vetche* could

---

\* “Sunways : a Record of Rambles in Many Lands,” p. 476. It is an open secret that the author of this book, printed, we regret to say, for private circulation only, is Mr. William Copeland Borlase, M.P. for East Cornwall.

† “Stepniak,” vol. i. p. 31.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 20.

§ *Ibid.* pp. 12, 15; conf. Hare, p. 171.

annul all or any of his decrees." \* The essential difference between the *Vetche* and any other popular assembly was the absence of any system of voting.

In every other republic, however free or democratic it might be—at Sparta and Rome, as well as at Athens and Florence—voting in one shape or another existed, and the principle that the minority should conform to the rule of the majority was the basis of all political procedure. In the Slav nature there seems something antagonistic to this principle. I say Slav, and not Russian, because among all the peoples of that race, possessed of genuinely free institutions, we invariably find that the principle of unanimous decision is the only principle which the popular conscience is able to accept.†

The *Vetche* of old Russia was oftentimes a very turbulent assembly. When burning questions arose the stronger party found an effective means of overcoming opposition, and the matter would be decided by fist or knife; but, as a general rule, moderate counsels prevailed, and differences were pacifically settled by persuasion and mutual concession. "The most ancient map of Russia," says Gibbon, "affords some places which still retain their names and position—e.g., Novogorod and Kiow. . . . In their origin these two cities were no more than camps or fairs; the most convenient stations in which the barbarians might assemble for the occasional business of war or trade."‡ There were then no burghers, no trading classes. "The agricultural classes roamed at will over the vast Russian plains in search of a more fruitful soil or less onerous conditions. Entire villages disappeared in one place to reappear in another."§ By the fourteenth century Novogorod had become one of the greatest of European cities, worthy by "its power and riches of being called the Northern Venice. It was the capital of a vast republic which included the northern half of modern Russia, stretching as far as the Ural Mountains, and containing large towns and important cities."|| After Moscow became the capital, Novogorod remained the "second largest and most commercial city in Russia."¶ The records of the old republic of Novogorod are the best material for the study of early Russian institutions. "It is now only a small provincial chief town of 18,000 inhabitants."\*\* "As a relic of former grandeur," says Mr. Hare, "few places are more interesting or more melancholy. . . . On one of the squares of the now de-

\* Stepniak, vol. i. p. 19.

† *Ibid.* p. 24.

‡ Gibbon, "Decline and Fall," &c., chap. lv. Kiow apparently is the same city as that now called Kieff, *vide* Hare, p. 438 *et seq.*

§ Stepniak, vol. i. p. 39.

|| *Ibid.* p. 21.

¶ Hare, p. 172.

\*\* Stepniak, vol. i. p. 22; Hare, p. 170.

populated city the stranger is shown the place where, at the stroke of the great bell which was there suspended, the sovereign people were wont to meet. Its sacred rope was free to all, every citizen being competent to summon the *Vetche* for deliberation on any subject affecting the welfare of individuals or the State.\* Or, as another writer says, "It was the assembly of the citizens summoned by the great bell, to meet in the Court of Yarislof, which was the true sovereign."†

By a strange inconsistency the peasantry of despotic Russia enjoy—save for some abuses—almost as great a measure of self-government as the rural communes of Sweden and Norway. The pure and simple democracy of Russia yet lingers in the *Mir*—"the village assembly, composed of all adult males free from paternal authority, which decides without appeal every local question."‡ Mr. Hare adds, "When women are heads of households they are present."§ We shall see that there is no voting in the *Mir* any more than there was in the *Vetche*; therefore the presence of female heads of families in the communal assembly makes them equal with the men.

The Russian word *Mir* [we are told] has a different signification in the language of business, the law, and of the educated classes, from what it has in that of the people. In the first case it is identical with the French word *Commune*, being the aggregate of persons living together in the same place, the police jurisdiction of a city, town or village; but the meaning is quite different in the common conception of the people. Even the literal signification of the word *Mir* indicates the sacredness of the idea, denoting both commune and the world; the Greek *Cosmos* is the only equivalent to the Russian word.||

This idea of the sacred character of the *Mir* appears in many popular proverbs—e.g., "Whatever the *Mir* decides is ordained of God."¶

The powers of the *Mir* are great. It has the right of distributing the communal lands, which are divided according to the numbers of "revision souls," a system which has often very harsh results, as a widow with little children may receive the same as a man with strong able-bodied sons; and the same taxes have to be paid on bad as on good land, when the distribution has once been made. A division of land always lasts till a new revision, which only takes place once in every fifteen years, and in that time the circumstances of the families entirely change.

\* Stepniak, vol. i. p. 22; Hare, p. 170.

† Rambaud, "Histoire de la Russie," quoted by Hare, p. 171.

‡ Stepniak, vol. i. p. 2. § Hare, p. 152.

|| Haxthausen, "The Russian Empire," as quoted by Hare, p. 153.

¶ Stepniak, vol. i. p. 5, and Haxthausen, as quoted by Hare *ubi supra*.

"By the Russian communal system, one-half of all the arable land in the empire is now reserved to the peasantry, who comprise five-sixths of the population." The reason of this anomaly—the existence of these democratic communes under an autocracy—is to be found in what has been the general origin of popular rights, want of money on the part of the rulers. The Russian, like every other government, wants money; but in a wild, uncultivated country, of vast extent and without roads, and with an ever migratory population, "except in rare cases, individual members of the community can neither be coerced nor controlled. The State may pass laws and demand taxes, but it can neither by ordinary means enforce obedience to the one nor payment of the other. For these reasons, Russian governments have been compelled to recognize the rural communes, to confirm their privileges, treat with them as independent corporations, and allow them to manage their own affairs." † Of late years the Government has sought to diminish the powers of the *Mir*. Formerly it was the sole legal tribunal of the commune, but now a special village court, consisting of ten judges elected by the *Mir*, has been created. Another measure has made valid only those meetings of the *Mir* which may be convened by the *starosta* (village mayor), instead of, according to ancient custom, by the humblest member of the village. The election of the *starosta* by the *Mir* is now contingent on his approval by a functionary called the Mediator, appointed jointly by the Central Government and the local nobility, "but where the administration has not been strong enough to enforce these measures, the communal autonomy has suffered no restriction." ‡ The proceedings of these rural assemblies are graphically described by M. Stepniak:—

The meetings of a village commune, like those of the *Landes gemende* of the primitive Swiss cantons, are held under the vault of heaven, before the *starosta's* house, before a tavern or at any other convenient place. The thing that most strikes a person who is present for the first time at one of these meetings, is the utter confusion which seems to characterize its proceedings. Chairman there is none; the debates are scenes of the wildest disorder. After the convener has explained his reasons for calling the meeting, everybody rushes in to express his opinion, and for a while the debate resembles a free fight of pugilists. The right of speaking belongs to him who can command attention. If an orator pleases his audience, interrupters are promptly silenced; but if he says nothing worth hearing, nobody heeds him, and he is "shut up" by the first opponent. When the question is somewhat of a burning one, and the meeting begins to grow warm, all speak at

\* Haxthausen, as quoted by Hare, p. 152; conf. Stepniak, vol. i. p. 29.

† Stepniak, vol. i. p. 29.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 8.



once, and none listen. On these occasions the assembly breaks up into groups, each of which discusses the subject on its own account. Everybody shouts his arguments at the top of his voice; shrieks and objurgations, words of contumely and derision are heard on every hand, and a wild uproar goes on, from which it does not seem possible that any good can result. It is a necessary means to a certain end. In our village assemblies voting is unknown; controversies are never decided by a majority of votes. Every question must be settled unanimously. Hence the general debate, as well as private discussions, have to be continued until a proposal is brought forward which conciliates all interests and wins the suffrage of the entire *Mir*. It is, however, evident that to reach this consummation, the debates must be thorough and the subject well threshed out; and in order to overcome isolated opposition, it is essential for the advocates of conflicting views to be brought face to face, and compelled to fight out their differences in single combat.\*

M. Stepniak claims for this mode of legislation that "it is based on an undeniably generous sentiment, respect for the rights of minorities—a sentiment declared by an eminent English political writer to be the foundation of true liberty."† In the absence of any presiding officer, and the decision of questions by unanimity, and not by the vote of the majority, the *Mir* resembles one, and so far as we know only one, English assembly—"the yearly general meeting of the Society of Friends." How was it then that the independent States of old Russia—republics in fact, though principalities in name—were transformed into an Imperial despotism organized on the strictest principles of bureaucratic control? The cause seems to have been this: like the feudal barons, these independent princes warred incessantly among themselves, till at length the country devastated by their incessant feuds demanded peace at any price, and the price the country had to pay for peace was submission to the rule of a single prince.‡ "The civil discord of the great dukes or princes of Russia," says Gibbon, "betrayed their country to the Tatars. They spread from Livonia to the Black Sea, and both Moscow and Kiow, the ancient and modern capitals of the city, were reduced to ashes; a temporary ruin, less fatal than the deep, and perhaps indelible, mark which a servitude of two hundred years has imprinted on the character of the Russians."§

The monarchy of the Tzars was established, or perhaps it would be more accurate to say consolidated, by Ivan III., who reigned from 1462 to 1505. A great source of the strength

\* Stepniak, vol. i. pp. 4, 5.

† *Ibid.* p. 25.

‡ Stepniak, vol. i. chap. v., "The Making of the Despotism," p. 33 *et seq.*

§ Gibbon, "Decline and Fall," &c., chap. lxiv.

and durability of the despotic rule of the Tzars was the influence of the clergy. In the beginning they were the means of introducing the rudiments of culture amongst the savage inhabitants of the land. "They put themselves at the head of every national movement, and when victory smiled on the Muscovite arms it was the Church that reaped the richest reward; and now the all-powerful clergy, who hold in their hands the ingenuous and confiding soul of the nation, have become faithful servitors of the despot and ardent supporters of absolutism."\*

In the spirit of our English High Churchmen, Russian theologians "are pleased to say that the Tzar is not the head of the Russian Church; that she recognizes no other head than Jesus Christ;" but as in England, so "in Russia, to draw from this abstract theory practical conclusions is counting without the host." In fact, "Russian government councils have been compelled by the power of the Tzar to sanction practices and doctrines which the canons and the apostles condemned as abominations."† The subjection of the Church to the Tzar is shown by the fact that in 1721 Peter the Great, of his mere will and pleasure, abolished the Patriarchate of Moscow, and substituted in its place "the Most Holy Synod," of which the "Tzar" is the mainspring "and the pendulum." Peter frankly expressed his reason for making the change:—

The common people are incapable of understanding the distinction between the spiritual and the temporal power; dazzled by the virtue and splendour which illumine the chief pastor of the Church, they imagine him to be a second sovereign, equal in power to the autocrat, and even superior to him. If a disagreement arises between the patriarch and the Tzar, they are inclined to espouse the cause of the former, imagining that in it they espouse the cause of God himself.‡

We add another illustration of this "royal supremacy:" when in England, Peter gave his consent to the admission of a small quantity of tobacco into Russia, a deputation of merchants who were admitted in his presence expressed their apprehensions that the Russian clergy would cry out against any relaxation of the ancient law which prohibited the bringing of tobacco into the country; but, says the historian, "the deputation were assured by the air with which the Tzar told them that he knew how to keep priests in order."§ The effect upon the instructed classes of the priests having made themselves the tools of the

---

\* Stepiak, vol. i. p. 47.† *Ibid.* p. 45.

‡ Hare, p. 232.

§ Macaulay's "History of England," chap. xxiii.

autocrat, is that "they abandon in thousands the faith of their fathers;" amongst the less instructed classes, "the people do not respect the clergy, but persecute them with derision and reproaches, and feel them to be a burden."\* According to the author of "Sunways," "the greater part of the country priests are devoid of education, and given to drink."† While on the subject of the Russian Church, we venture on a digression in order to show the impression made on this careful observer by the churches and ritual of Russia:—

On first entering one of these Kremlin churches, I was at once struck between the similarity which I saw there, both in ceremonial and in decoration, to what we had left behind in the Buddhist temples of the East. Round the walls, just as in Ceylon, were the square panels, each containing a picture of a disciple, while above them were portrayed the miracles and the principal incidents in the life of the Founder of the religion. At the sides of the church, just as in Japan, were the separate shrines of popular saints, where persons were touching the pictures or the reliquary, and giving their devotion at the same time; then there were the beads, and the incense, and the *sanctum sanctorum*, dimly seen through the open work of the screen; then there were the stalls at which candles were sold, just as in China, to be used as offerings at the shrine of some peculiarly favourite saint; and lastly, there were the pigeons feeding in the courtyards, preserved from harm as long as they dwelt in the holy precincts. As I looked on I said to myself, "This is surely Buddhism sheathed in gilt."‡

Under the Romanoff Tzars, Russia became a veritable theocracy, but "theocracy means stagnation," and "the country in truth was sinking into a veritable Chinese torpor. The more it indulged in self-admiration, the more it tried to preserve itself from contact with the West, the deeper it relapsed into barbarism. All the travellers who visited Russia in the seventeenth century were struck by the lowness of its culture and the backwardness of its civilization."§ The narratives of these travellers may still be read with interest:—

They describe vividly, and sometimes bitterly, the savage ignorance and the squalid poverty of the barbarous country in which they had sojourned. In that country, they said, there was neither literature nor science, neither school nor college. It was not till more than a hundred years after the invention of printing that a single printing-press had been introduced into the Russian empire; and that printing-press had speedily perished in a fire which was supposed to have been kindled by the priests. Even in the seventeenth century, the library

\* From an official report given in Wallace's "Russia," quoted by Hare, pp. 320, 321.

† "Sunways," p. 460.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 463.

§ Stepniak, vol. i. pp. 53, 54, 57.

of a prelate of the first dignity consisted of a few manuscripts. These manuscripts, too, were in long rolls, for the art of bookbinding was unknown. The best educated men could scarcely read and write. It was much if the secretary, to whom was entrusted the direction of the negotiations with foreign Powers, had a sufficient smattering of dog Latin to make himself understood. The arithmetic was the arithmetic of the Dark Ages. The denary notation was unknown. Even in the Imperial treasury the computations were made by the help of balls strung on wires. Round the person of the Sovereign there was a blaze of gold and jewels, but even in his most splendid palaces were to be found the filth and misery of an Irish cabin. So late as the year 1663 the gentlemen of the retinue of the Earl of Carlisle were, in the city of Moscow, thrust into a single bedroom, and were told that if they did not remain together they would be in danger of being devoured by rats.\*

A singular habit of the late Tzar Nicholas may have had its origin in the "filth and misery" of the palaces of his forefathers. We are told that when, in 1817, he—being then Grand Duke—visited Claremont, "a leathern sack was filled in the stable with hay for the Grand Duke by his servants, on which he always sleeps."† During the reign of Alexis, father of Peter the Great, Russia was visited with "a social and economic crisis of unexampled severity. . . . The emergency could be met only by measures both efficacious and prompt—by the rough ways of revolution rather than by ordinary methods of reform."‡ This work was undertaken by Peter the Great.

Making a clean sweep of antiquated and hierarchic pretensions, Peter never hesitated to pass over all his nobles, and raise to the highest posts in his service the obscurest plebeians in whom he discerned high capacity for affairs. His administration, organized on the German model, with ramifications everywhere, depending only on the chief of the State, became absolute and supreme. The entire nation, people, nobles, and clergy, Peter seized in his strong grasp, and did with them what he would. His one thought was to make Russia a powerful State. To this end he bent all his energies and forced every interest and every class to co-operate in its accomplishment.§

He completely "succeeded, but at great cost to his people of every rank and class. From the age of twenty, those of the nobles who were sound in mind and body were required, when called upon, to serve the State in one capacity or other, either as soldiers, sailors, or administrators, until death, only disablement by wounds or complete decrepitude giving them the right to return to their homes."|| "In order that this compulsory

---

\* Macaulay, "History of England," chap. xxiii.

† "Mémoires of Baron Stockmar," vol. i. p. 57.

‡ Stepiak, vol. i. pp. 58-61.

§ *Ibid.* p. 68.

|| *Ibid.* p. 69.

[Vol. CXXIV. No. CCXLVII.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LXVIII. No. I. K

service might be effective, the young nobles were compelled to be educated. As a compensation for the bondage of the nobles to the State, their lands, which had previously been only held for life, were made hereditary possessions in fee simple; but as the peasants always went with the land, they now became, in the fullest sense of the words, the slaves of the nobles. In 1762, Peter III. decreed "the emancipation of the nobles." Thenceforward they were left free to serve the State or not as they pleased; but serfage, no longer needed in the "interest of the Government, was retained for the benefit of the aristocracy,"\* until it was discovered that Russia was no exception to the universal rule, "that wherever slavery prevails there arrives a time when it ceases to profit individuals, and becomes prejudicial to the best interests of the State." The serfdom of the peasantry was abolished in 1861. It was accompanied by a general movement among all the instructed classes of Russian society "in favour of Liberalism and all that it signifies."† This was firmly resisted by the Government. One concession was made—the establishment, in 1864, of [the *Zemstvo*] local parliaments, so called. In the view of the Government "the *Zemstvo* is its natural enemy." Its powers were from the first very limited. Aristocratic in its composition—meeting only once a year, and for such short sessions that it had no time to discuss general questions, and without executive agents to carry into effect its decrees, "the Russian *Zemstvo* laboured with all zeal and devotion to the good of the people, and not for the benefit of the class to which the majority of them belonged." The Government, therefore, more and more restricted their powers until their utility is now attenuated almost to nothingness.‡ In fact, the Government in every way "runs counter to the best interests of the nation, and, while oppressing the still ignorant masses, wages against the instructed class a war without mercy and without truce. For twenty-five years has this contest continued, ever extending, ever developing fresh phases, and becoming ever more cruel and desperate;"§ so that the language in which, in 1851, Mr. Gladstone described the state of things then existing in Naples under the rule of Bomba, is exactly and literally applicable to the Russia of to-day:—

Law, instead of being respected, is odious. Force and not affection is the foundation of government. There is no association, but a violent antagonism, between the idea of freedom and that of order. The governing power, which teaches of itself that it is the image of God upon earth, is clothed, in the view of the overwhelming majority

\* Stepniak, vol. i. pp. 77, 78.

† *Ibid.* chap. xxix., "The *Zemstvo*," p. 159 *et seq.*

† *Ibid.* pp. 79, 81.

§ *Ibid.* p. 82.

of the thinking public, with all the vices for its attributes. I have seen and heard the strong and too true expression used—"This is the negation of God erected into a system of Government." ["E' la negazione di Dio eretta a sistema di governo."]\*

Peter the Great converted the theocracy of old Russia into a military despotism. The Tzar, though powerful, is no longer a god. Nominally he is still as omnipotent as in the old times, but he is in fact disregarded in the obeisance offered to his parasites;† for he is surrounded by courtiers. And what, asks M. Stepniak, is a courtier? And he thus answers his own question—"He is a man in whom training from generation to generation has developed to the highest degree of effectiveness one single capacity—that of enforcing his will on his sovereign while making him believe that he is obeyed."‡ M. Stepniak then proceeds to show how this process of delusion is carried out:—

The Tzar having the power to transform into act every thought, every whim, he is preserved from all that may suggest to him such thoughts or whims. It is the fact that there is not a single man in the hundred and one millions of the Tzar's subjects who is more watched or observed in his personal intercourse, whose intellectual food is submitted to stricter censorship, or more carefully selected, than the Tzar's. He reads only extracts of what is thought good for him to know, he does not meet with anybody whom his courtiers would like him to shun. There are hundreds of ways to obtain this effect without seeming to impose on the sovereign's pleasure, and that is done, and has been done, for years and generations, and not only with the Tzar himself, but with every member of his family.§

And he describes the actual *modus operandi* of the auto-cracy:—

Everything is done in writing; nothing left to personal freedom or initiative; the most trifling matters ascend from the inferior agents of the system up to the highest, the Tzar. What, for instance, will the reader think of the following one out of thousands of quite similar "all highest orders," as they are called in official language, the Tzar's ukase? It refers to nothing more or less than to the students' blouses. I transcribe it in all its bureaucratic candour:—

"Having heard the all humblest report [so the document ran] of the Minister of the State Domain, his Majesty the Emperor—

\* "First Letter to the Earl of Aberdeen on the State Prosecutions of the Neapolitan Government," by the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P., 1851, reprinted in "Gleanings of Past Years, 1851-1877," vol. i. pp. 6, 7.

† Clarke's "Travels in Russia," quoted by Hare, p. 20.

‡ Stepniak, vol. ii. p. 266.

§ *Ibid.* p. 270. "It is of course alike the art and the interest of every functionary, high and low, to keep the Emperor within an impassable circle" (Sir John Bowring, "Autobiographical Recollections," p. 119).

15th October of the current year (1884)—all highly deigned to order in supplement to the model dresses, all highly approved by his Majesty (the 3rd May, 1882), to the students of the Moscow Agricultural Academy, is granted permission during the lessons in the Academy, and in practical work, to wear blouses—the winter of brown grey woollen stuff, the summer of light yellow (unbleached) linen—with a brown leather strap adorned with a metallic clasp, on which, interwoven with a crown of spikes, must be drawn the letters P and A in old Slav character.”

Can the time of the supreme ruler of one hundred and one millions be better employed than with deep questions as to the colour and material of students' blouses, whether they wore blouses or jackets, or the letters on the clasps are in Slav or Gothic character? This question is not very complicated, it is true. If the Tzar have no particular taste for tailoring he may settle it at once. But this draft order must be read over to him before being signed, must at least be mentioned to him. He must give his Yes or No; must lose a part of his time; and if every Minister bring him a hundred such trifles, how much of his working time will the Tzar keep for the things that are not trifles? And it is easy to see that any Minister can produce as many trivialities as are required to fill up his master's leisure, and deprive him of all possibility of giving serious attention to matters of importance. Thus the Tzar can only act by his Ministers' advice.\*

Bacon, in his essay on “Cunning,” says, “I knew a counsellor and secretary that never came to Queen Elizabeth of England with bills to sign but he would also first put her into some discourse of State that she would less mind the bills.” The Tzar seems managed by the same kind of what Bacon calls “sinister or crooked wisdom,” mixed with the corruption of the bureaucracy, which Mr. Hare says is “an ulcer which ceaselessly devours the country.”

M. Stepniak gives an illustration which he calls quite “authentic and characteristic, how the most simple contrivance serves to make a fool of the Tzar” :—

In the first years of Alexander III.'s reign a Samara nobleman, of the name of K——, wanted a governmental allowance of 200,000 roubles to start a leather manufactory. Many large Russian manufacturers get considerable sums of money “as an encouragement of national industry.” All was arranged well. Everybody who had to be bribed was bribed. Mr. K—— was quite sure of success so far that, returning to Samara, he did not choose to wait the few weeks that remained before the Emperor's definitive confirmation, and borrowed from a Tatar merchant the sum promised him and set to work at once. Great was his disappointment and despair when he received a telegram stating bluntly that the Emperor did not confirm the allowance. He

---

\* Stepniak, vol. ii. p. 266.

rushes to St. Petersburg to his protectors. How? What is it? Nobody knew. All was done right as promised. But the Emperor refused—a whim took him. It is quite incomprehensible. We cannot help it. Mr. K—— deemed himself a ruined man. But one fine morning, when he left the Minister of the Interior, he was followed by a *holonatchalnik*, head clerk of one of the numerous offices. The man asked him plainly if he consented to give him the sum of 10,000 roubles if the thing was put right. Mr. K—— exclaimed he would be happy to give even 20,000. The clerk refused to give any explanation, and they parted. At the next month Mr. K—— received a telegram stating the allowance is granted by the Emperor. Full of exultation he rushed once more to St. Petersburg, receives his 200,000, found the clerk, his benefactor, and gave him the 20,000 roubles promised. Touched by such an act of honesty and faithfulness, to a promise made in a momentary excitement, the clerk said that he wanted to tranquillize the conscience of Mr. K—— by explaining to him that in obtaining the allowance no underhand means were employed, and all was done with complete honesty and fairness. He then told him the small device which was used to make the Emperor change his mind. "We have," he said, "always a great number of things to present for the Emperor's examination, and we know beforehand what he will be pleased to read and what will be unpleasant. Now all depends on the order in which such a petition as yours is placed. If before it we put four or five unpleasant things, the Emperor, when he arrives at your petition, will be in a bad humour and refuse it. If, on the contrary, we put before it, one after another, five things that will be agreeable to him to read, on reaching your petition he will be put in good-humour and grant it at once."\*

This mixture of fraud and corruption has ever prevailed in every department of the Russian Government. Sir John Bowring visited St. Petersburg in 1819.

The proprietor of the house in which I lived [he records] had many years before committed forgeries in one of the public offices, but he was perfectly free. The judge, to whom his case was referred, was a military officer (a general), who had a pile of documents, the records of various offences, the latest of which was placed at the bottom of the pile, and as they were cleared away, one after another, the lowest document gradually mounted. My host, a few days before his case reached the summit (which was about once in three years), received from the general's secretary a notice that an adjudication was at hand, upon which a bribe was sent in accordance to arrangement and the case was removed to the bottom of the pile.†

Mr. Cobden, when in 1847 he visited Russia, heard much of the corruption of the Government employés, and relates the following instance:—

---

\* Stepniak, vol. ii. p. 274, note. † "Autobiographical Recollections," p. 119.



My informant, an English merchant, had a contract with one of the departments for a quantity of *lignum vitæ*, at eight roubles a pood. Upon its being delivered it was pronounced inferior and rejected, after being stamped at the end of each log. He called at the bureau to complain and remonstrate, but without success, and on leaving was followed by a person who asked his address and said he would call upon him. He was as good as his word, and the following conversation occurred: "You have charged your wood too low, it is not possible to furnish a good quality at eight roubles. You must send in another delivery at twelve roubles." "But I have no other quality," was the reply. "Leave that to me," said the person. "You must address a petition to the department, saying that you are prepared to send in another delivery. I will draw up the petition—you must sign it. I will manage the rest, and you will pay me 1,000 roubles, which will be half the difference of the extra price you will receive." He consulted with his friends, who advised him to comply, and he accordingly signed the petition. The person then had the rejected *lignum vitæ* conveyed to a warehouse, where the ends were sawed off the logs to remove the stamp, and the identical wood was delivered and passed for full weight and good quality.\*

M. Stepniak gives another illustration of the corruption universally prevalent in Russia, in his chapter entitled, "A Sample from the Bulk."† It is the history of what is called in Russia a communal bank, and it is thus summed up—"All robbed the bank, Mayor Ikonnikoff robbed, Mayor Ootschinnikov robbed, the town clerk robbed. The monthly audit was a farce. The books were never looked at, the cash was never counted, the balance-sheet was signed without being examined." In short, "all the public offices of Russia," says Mr. Hare, "are full of civilized robbers who have not courage to work in open day. How the people hate and despise the official world by which they are pillaged" (p. 20).

We observe that M. Stepniak refers to the Senate, and mentions it as sometimes exercising judicial functions,‡ but he gives no description of its constitution, whether it be hereditary or elective, or say whether there is in it anything of the representative element, nor does he describe its ordinary functions. In the absence of any information, we may safely assume that its members are mere nominees of the Tzar, and exercise no control over either him or the bureaucracy.

It was, we think, David Hume who said that "the aim and object of the English constitution was to get twelve men into a jury box;" meaning, we suppose, that pure administration of justice according to law is the great end of all good govern-

---

\* Morley's "Life of Richard Cobden," vol. i. p. 458.

† Chap. xxxii., vol. ii. p. 230 *et seq.*

‡ *Vide* vol. i. pp. 152, 153.

ment. Let us now, therefore, see how justice is administered in Russia so far forth as political cases are concerned. "In a country like Russia," says M. Stepniak, "where the authorities can do absolutely what they please with a man, after as well as before judgment, the way in which trials are conducted becomes a matter of secondary importance;"\* and elsewhere he says: "In Russia juridic procedure is not the main point. It is secondary and accessory. The chief point is to secure the prisoner, to keep him in 'durance vile.' As for trying him, examining the proofs against him, determining his innocence or his guilt, these are things about which there is no hurry—they can wait."† "Preventive detention," for the purpose of preventing the accused from evading examination and judgment, is the foundation of the Russian judicial system in political cases. Here again the words of Mr. Gladstone, describing the heretofore existing state of things in Italy, exactly describe the state of things existing in Russia to-day. "Men are arrested, not because they have committed, or are believed to have committed, any offence, but because they are persons whom it is thought convenient to confine and get rid of, and against whom, therefore, some charge must be found or fabricated."‡

M. Stepniak describes at length, and very graphically, a visit to a private house made by the police in the middle of the night to search for compromising books, papers, and private letters, in the possession of a young lady who has incurred their suspicion. The following scene, according to M. Stepniak, is no imaginary one, and similar scenes are common events:—

A policeman opens the drawer of a little cabinet, in which the young lady keeps her own particular letters, and as he fumbles among them she perceives a bit of paper whose existence she had forgotten. The sight of this morsel of manuscript moves her to the quick. She becomes painfully agitated, for, though there is nothing in it which can hurt her, it contains a name and an address which may be the means of delivering another to imprisonment and exile, and the fault will be hers! After a cursory glance at the paper the officer lays it aside and goes on with the inspection of her letters, a proceeding which suggests to the girl a desperate expedient. With a single bound she is at the cabinet, and, seizing the paper, puts it into her mouth. But at the very same moment two brutal hands are at her throat. With a cry of indignation the father rushes forward to protect his child. In vain! Before he can reach her he is pushed back, forced into a chair, and held there fast, while three of the ruffians deal with the young girl. One holds her hands, another grasps her throat, and

---

\* Stepniak, vol. i. p. 151.† *Ibid.* p. 113.

‡ "Gleanings of Past Years," vol. iv. p. 11.

the third, forcibly opening her mouth, thrusts into it his dirty fingers to get out the paper which she is trying to swallow—writhing, panting, and desperate, she does her utmost to accomplish her purpose, but the odds against her are too great. After a great struggle the *zerbere* lays on the table a piece of white pulp, streaked with blood, and as the men loose their hold their victim falls fainting on the floor. The insolent conduct, as it is called, of Miss N—— will be fully set forth in the official depositions. Whether the address which Miss N—— desired to destroy be deciphered or not will now make very little difference to her personally. The mere attempt will be taken as proof of conscious guilt.\*

We have not space to describe the carrying off of this poor girl from her father's house to "the House of Preventive Detention," nor of her sufferings and those of her fellow-prisoners—sufferings frequently ending in madness or death.† It is not uncommon for prisoners to be detained in this house for two or even three years,‡ before being brought before the Tzar's procurator; but the unfortunate Miss Battushkoff was examined the very day of her arrest. We resume our quotation:—

The suspicions already conceived—suspicions which had suggested the nocturnal search—were confirmed by her attempt to destroy her friend's letter. From this she found, to her great relief, nothing more was known. All the same, she was roundly accused of belonging to a secret society, having for its object "the overthrow of the existing order, subversion of property, religion, and the family," and so forth. These charges she naturally denied. She was accused of other offences, and many searching questions were put touching her supposed connection with the revolutionary movement. All were answered in the negative. "Very well," said the procurator, at length, "you will have to reflect. Take No. 39 back to her cell, warder." §

After a lapse of seven months, when she almost abandoned hope, she was called before the procurator to undergo still another questioning.

They did not keep her long in suspense. The examination was brief and sharp. "Have you reflected?" "Yes, I have reflected." "Have you anything to add to your previous depositions?" "Nothing, indeed!" Go back to your cell then; I will make you rot there." This is the stereotyped expression—an expression which few political prisoners have not repeatedly heard.

\* Stepniak, vol. i. pp. 91, 92, 93. A note at p. 93 states: "It happened thus to Miss Varvara Battushkoff, daughter of General Nicolas Battushkoff. See also the cases mentioned in chap. xi. of the same volume, p. 96 *et seq.*"

† See vol. i. chap. xii. p. 114 *et seq.*

‡ *Vide* vol. i. p. 126.

§ *Ibid.* p. 127. Prisoners in Russia seem to be called by the number of their cell.

Poor Thirty-nine (we are told) still languishes in her cell, so wofully changed by confinement and solitude that even her own mother would hardly know her;\* and this is only one out of a multitude of similar cases. Here is another illustration of Russian judicial examination. The Tzar's procurator tries to compel confessions by threats of death:—"You know that I can hang you," Strelnikoff† was in the habit of saying to his victims. "The military tribunal will do whatever I direct." The prisoner knew it only too well. "Very well," would continue the public prosecutor, "confess, or in a week you will be hanged like a dog."‡ If, and when the unfortunate prisoner is brought to trial—the trial, as will be anticipated, is a mere farce, a prostitution of justice, and the perversion of power. In 1872 appeared a "law" withdrawing political cases from the jurisdiction of the ordinary tribunals, and placing at the same time considerable restrictions on reports of political trials. It was ordained that political cases should henceforth be judged by special tribunals created for the purpose, under the designation of "Particular Senatorial Chambers," composed of three senators named by the Emperor *ad hoc*; to whom were added so-called representatives of the three orders—nobility, third estate, and peasants chosen by the Government for each trial, from among the marshals of the nobility, the mayors of towns, and the *starchina* (managers) of rural communes. The description of the first trial under the new system may remind some readers of Charles Lever's story of the Irish jury, who assured the judge of assize "that they were ready to stop till they had hanged every mother's son of them, if it pleased his lordship."

There sat, with the three senators, the marshal of the nobility of Tchernigoff, the mayor of Odessa, and the *starschina* of Gatschino. . . . The so-called representatives of the three orders represented in reality nothing but the Minister's wishes. Their docility was admirable. The representative of the peasantry distinguished himself by a zeal which might be called excessive. When the witnesses had been heard and the pleadings were finished, the six judges retired to their consulting-room. The president requested this gentleman, as the junior member of the hierarchic order, to say what sentence, in his opinion, should be passed on the delinquents. In every instance the worthy man gave the same answer: "Hulks—give them all the hulks." On this the president suggested that, as the accused were not all equally guilty, it would not be right to visit every one of them with the same punishment. But the *starschina* of Gatschino was quite impervious to such fine-drawn distinctions. "Give them all

\* Stepniak, vol. i. pp. 129–30. † At one time the Tzar's procurator.

‡ Stepniak, vol. i. p. 143.

penal servitude, your excellency," repeated the improvised judge, "all of them. Have I not sworn to decide impartially?"\*

When what M. Stepniak calls the "terrorist period" began, the Government abolished these senatorial chambers. By ukase of April 5, 1879, Russia was divided into six "satrapies"—the term is M. Stepniak's—and since that time "political offenders of every sort have been tried exclusively by officers of the army, the only class in the country whom the authorities considered competent to exercise judicial functions; the part of minister of justice is taken by generals and other military dignities in high command."† The composition of these military courts varies according to the taste, the caprice, and the ideas of the different generals by whom they are ordered. Prisoners are allowed counsel, but these must be military officers who are candidates for judicial functions, and officially subordinate to the Tzar's procurator as to their own chief. On one occasion permission was given to the accused to retain regular counsel, but they were not allowed access to the depositions until two hours before the trial. It is said to be an incontestable fact that the sentences are prescribed beforehand,‡ according to the ideas of the governor-general of the province where the trial, if so it may be called, takes place.

A startling novelty, known as "accumulative sentences," has been introduced into the practices of these military courts. A man may be indicted for a number of offences, not any one of which is punishable by death; but where the authorities desire to hang a man they mark down the punishment due to each of such offences which are not punishable by death, add them together, and by a total perversion of logic and justice arrive at the wished-for conclusion. "He is guilty of death."§ With M. Stepniak, therefore, we come to the conclusion that "in Russia, for political offences, there is neither justice nor mercy."

Macaulay, in his description of the scene at the Black Hole of Calcutta, says: "Nothing in history or fiction, not even the story which Ugolino told in the sea of everlasting ice, after he had wiped his bloody lips on the scalp of his murderer, approaches the horrors which were recounted by the few survivors of that night."|| Those words may, without exaggeration, be applied to M. Stepniak's description of the sufferings of the political prisoners in Schlüsselberg, the central prisons, the

\* Stepniak, vol. i. pp. 153-4.

† *Ibid.* p. 163.

‡ *Ibid.* pp. 164-5.

§ *Ibid.* pp. 166-7.

|| *Ibid.* p. 174. *Vide* Macaulay's "Essay on Lord Clive."

ravelin of Troubetskoi and the bagnios of Siberia,\* from which our contracting space forbids us to transcribe. But beyond and above all that we have said of Russian judicial procedure, falsely so called, there remains the fact that the "Government arbitrarily orders into exile, with equal indifference, persons who have been tried and acquitted, witnesses who have testified truly, and citizens who, for some inscrutable reasons, are simply suspected of latent sedition. We therefore come to this, that the liability of Russian subjects to be exiled is limited only by the good pleasure of the gendarmerie and the police."† As a concrete illustration of this state of things we give this:—

Mr. Belousoff, professor in one of the colleges at Kieff, was arrested in the summer of 1879, dismissed from his post and exiled to the north, all owing to a pure "misunderstanding," as they say in Russia, on the part of the police, and pure misfortune on his; the head and front of the poor man's offending being the name he bore—the name of Belousoff. So did somebody else with whom the police confounded him. When the mistake was explained to the governor of Kieff, and he was requested to revoke the sentence passed on an admittedly innocent man, he answered in these words: "I quite believe that what you say is quite true, but in a time of trouble like the present the administration cannot afford to make mistakes. So let him go into exile, and in a little while he may petition me for a revocation."‡

It is difficult to believe that in this age the government of any country, professing to be civilized, should issue the official document here transcribed:—

The gendarmerie of Moscow accused Mr. Isidor Goldsmith, and his wife Sophia, of having come to Moscow intent on founding a central revolutionary committee. After a minute domiciliary search, and an examination for the discovery of proofs, the charges brought against the before-mentioned persons were found to be quite without justification; consequently the Minister of the Interior and the chief of the gendarmerie decree that Isidor Goldsmith, and Sophia his wife, be transported to Archangelsk, and there placed under the supervision of the local police.§

The cases we have cited, and many others of the same kind adduced by M. Stepniak, are, he assures us, neither exceptional nor extreme.

We cannot conclude this part of our subject better than by adapting to our purpose Mr. Gladstone's burning words as to the similar atrocities in Italy:—

\* *Vide* Stepniak, vol. i. chap. xviii., "After Judgment," p. 178 *et seq.*; chap. xix., "The Troubetskoi Ravelin," p. 204 *et seq.*; chap. xx., "Siberia," p. 234 *et seq.*

† *Ibid.* p. 263.

‡ *Ibid.* pp. 271-2-3.

§ *Ibid.* p. 279.

It is such violation of human and written law as this, carried on for the purpose of violating every other law, unwritten and eternal, human and divine; it is the wholesale persecution of virtue when united with intelligence, operating upon such a scale that entire classes may with truth be said to be its object, so that the Government is in bitter and cruel, as well as utterly illegal, hostility to whatever in the nation really lives and moves, and forms the mainspring of practical progress and improvement; it is the awful profanation of public religion, by its notorious alliance in the governing powers, with the violation of every moral law under the stimulants of fear and vengeance; it is the perfect prostitution of the judicial office, which has made it under veils only too threadbare and transparent the instrument of the Crown for the purpose of destroying the peace, the freedom, ay, and even, if not by capital sentences, the life of men among the most virtuous, upright, intelligent, distinguished, and refined of the whole community; it is the savage and cowardly system of moral, as well as in a lower degree of physical, torture through which the sentences extracted from the debased courts of justice are carried into effect.\*

From the mal-administration, or it would be more accurate to say the perversion, of justice, we turn to what M. Stepniak calls "the crusade of the Russian Government against culture."† The Tzar Nicolas, "in order, as he hoped, to counteract the pernicious effects of liberal culture, organized the universities like battalions, and lecture in the class-room was followed by drill in the square. Knowledge he regarded as a social bane, and military discipline as its only antidote."‡ Russian universities are centres of political life, and the students are therefore looked upon by the Government as a dark and dangerous power hostile to the laws and institutions of the realm.

A meeting of several students in the rooms of one of their number draws immediate attention, and gives rise to exaggerated fears. The porters, and even the proprietors of the rooms, are bound on their peril to give prompt information of the fact to the police, by whom such meetings are often dispersed. Besides being practically forbidden to enjoy each other's society, students, even in the privacy of their own chambers, are not free from annoyance. Although they may lead studious lives, meddle with nobody, and receive and make few visits, they are none the less submitted to a rigorous oversight.§

In a Russian university everybody, student and professor alike, is under police supervision. An authority, called the Inspector, is in fact a delegate of the general police. He can do almost anything, and with the approbation of the Minister

---

\* "Gleanings of Past Years," vol. iv. p. 6.

† Stepniak, vol. ii, part iv. p. 73 *et seq.*

‡ *Ibid.* p. 110.

§ *Ibid.* p. 78.

who directs his proceedings, he may expel a student for one or two years, or for ever, without any sort of inquiry or trial. Many of the students being very poor, depend for their daily bread on the giving of private lessons. This cannot be done without police authorization, and the Inspector by a stroke of his pen can deprive any of these students of the means of livelihood. Since 1878 all students in Russia have been placed permanently under martial law, although this monstrous regulation has not yet been applied in all its rigour; yet it is true that—to use the words of M. Stepniak—"Russian universities resemble rather fortresses whose garrisons are permeated with sedition, and ready at any moment to break into open mutiny, than homes of learning and science."\*

With regard to secondary schools, the policy of the Minister of Public Instruction is thus summarized by M. Stepniak:—

1. To oppose by every possible means the diffusion of secondary education, to render it as difficult as possible, and make no concession save at the last extremity, when all the means of resistance have been exhausted.

2. When resistance becomes impossible, to try to exclude from the benefits of secondary education the professional classes (to whom it is a matter of life and death), in order to confine it, as far as it may be, to the higher nobility and richer citizens.

3. The privilege once granted to these classes to make the instruction given to their children as sterile as possible, and so arrange matters that it may be imparted to the fewest number.†

With regard to primary instruction, the Russian characteristics are two marks or notes, which distinguish it from all other countries. One: "In other countries there is a *minimum* of education which all children must reach, in Russia there is a *maximum* beyond which they must not go."‡ The other: "That Russian schoolboys of from ten to seventeen may now be punished for so-called political offences and for holding erroneous political opinions."§ The general feeling of the Government on the nature and extent of education cannot be better shown than by referring to the educational code called the Gymnasial Regulations, "the explanatory appendix to which says roundly 'that the less history is studied the better.' The study of Russian literature is also banned, and general geography, on account of its 'dangerous tendencies,' is proscribed. It may suggest 'conflicting conclusions and give rise to useless reasonings.' In other words, the study of

\* Stepniak, vol. ii. p. 104.

† *Ibid.* p. 127.  
§ *Ibid.* p. 113.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 147.



geography may peradventure lead to discussions on political and social subjects.”\*

With a few words on the subject of voluntary religious education we dismiss the subject. In 1859 a movement began for the creation of Sunday-schools in every city and almost every town of the empire :—

The youth of both sexes threw themselves into the work with great ardour, and very soon excellent results were obtained. . . . But the Government viewed all this enthusiasm with dire alarm ; there was no telling to what terrible consequences the mixing of the poor and the rich, the ignorant and the instructed, might not give rise, and in the autumn of 1862 the Sunday-schools were suppressed by order of the Tzar, and so ended a good work nobly begun.†

Where education is so regarded by the Government, it follows, as a matter of course, “that Russia has never known anything which remotely resembles the liberty of the press or tolerance for political and religious ideas.”‡

The various measures taken by the Government of late years, which are explained by M. Stepniak in his chapter on “The Despotism and the Press,” § show that it is more than ever intolerant of free and unlicensed publication, whether in the shape of books, magazines, newspapers, or any other class of literature. “At the end of the nineteenth century the sole safeguard of the autocracy consists in the ignorance of the people. It is not enough to confiscate books and suppress Liberal papers: the only way to get rid of propagandism is to suppress readers.”||

From what has been said, it is clear that the Government of Russia under the Tzars is an autocracy leaning on, and hoodwinked by, a bureaucracy universally corrupt, and known by everybody to be so. With the Government is allied a Church with a superstitious creed and an ignorant priesthood, which co-operates with the State in its endeavours to keep the whole people in a state of profound ignorance. No wonder, therefore, that “discontent with the present régime has deepened and spread among all classes. It is no longer the army, but the flower of the Russian people, that is rising against despotism. It is no longer an isolated attack, but an implacable war, without truce or intermission, between the Russian nation and its Government.”¶ The Government, to preserve itself, is constrained to shut out society from all part in the management of public affairs. “Russia, therefore, has absolutely no future for

\* Stepniak, vol. ii. p. 115.

† *Ibid.* p. 189.

|| *Ibid.* p. 254.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 132.

§ *Ibid.* chap. xxx. p. 187 *et seq.*

¶ *Ibid.* vol. i. p. 206.

young men of noble natures and generous aspiration. Unless they consent to don the livery of the Tzar, or become members of a corrupt bureaucracy, they can neither serve their country nor take part in its affairs."

In spite of all efforts of the Government to carry into effect its policy of obscurantism, the educated classes are familiar with the literature of Liberalism and freethought, and the great majority are imbued with democratic and anti-despotic ideas; while "the peasants, if left to themselves and free to realize their strange ideals, would tell the Tzar to remain on the throne, but they would send to the rightabout, and probably massacre, every governor, policeman, and *tchinovik* in the land, and set up a series of democratic republics." \* In this condition of things lies "the weakness of Russia." It is evident that any country in such a state is on the verge of a change which may take either the form of a peaceful reform or of a revolutionary convulsion; and the longer it is delayed the more likely it is to take the more violent form. No such country can be really a dangerous foe in war. If the attention of the Government and its resources in men and money be absorbed in a foreign war, the better opportunity for Russian Liberals at home to rise against them. The Government, with its usual shortsightedness, lately had recourse to the common resource of despots to get rid of burning internal questions.† "Croyez moi," said the Empress Catherine to Segur in 1789, "une guerre seule peut changer la direction des esprits en France les reunir, donner un but plus utile aux passions et reveiller le vrai patriotisme." ‡ In the spirit of this remark the Russian Government endeavoured to engage the country in what M. Stepniak calls "an absurd, useless, bloody Afghan war. . . . No Russian parliament," he says, "would have answered the proposition otherwise than with laughter." His estimate of his countrymen's peaceful disposition corroborates what Mr. Cobden said of them:—"The Russians are, perhaps, naturally the least warlike people in the world. All their tastes and propensities are of an opposite character. Even in their amusements there is an absence of rudeness and violence." And he supports his opinion by that of one whose views on the Eastern Question did not generally agree with his own, Mr. Danby Seymour, who in his volume on "Russia and the Black Sea" remarks, "The most singular

\* Stepniak, vol. i. p. 31.

† *Ibid.* vol. ii. p. 8.

‡ Quoted in Alison's "History of Europe," vol. iv. p. 7. The Tory historian adds this comment: "In this observation is contained the true secret and the best vindication of the revolutionary war by England against France in 1793."

thing is that the people among whom this military organization of the whole nation prevails is, without exception, the most pacific nation on the face of the earth, and upon this point, I believe, no difference of opinion exists among all observers. Having lived for several years in a position which enabled me to mix much with the officers and men of the Russian army, such is my strong conviction of the Russian character." \*

M. Stepniak concludes his work with an appeal, founded on the facts he has adduced, to the European countries, but more especially to the English people, to aid the Liberal movement in Russia. "The public opinion of free countries has—as every Russian will admit [he says]—a most decisive and beneficial influence on Russian society. Every manifestation of sympathy for our liberative movement from the neighbouring countries is an event for Russia, and has no less a moral effect on our people than a manifestation of opposition in Russia itself. That is the mode in which European countries can contribute to strengthening the Liberal movement of our country." †

We hope M. Stepniak's appeal will be answered, and in the manner which he here indicates. We hope that some leading statesman will show the people of this country that whatever just grounds there may be for looking on the Government of Russia with jealousy and alarm, there is no ground for such feelings towards the Russian people; that a free self-determining Russia would be an element of peace in Europe; and endeavour to create in our people a sympathy with the struggles of the Russians to be free, and lead them to express it by every moral means. We give our absolute internal assent and consent to M. Stepniak's statement: "only the destruction of Russian autocracy can constitute Russia a guarantee of peace and free Europe from external danger;" and to his appeal to "all who are for progress, for peace and humanity, to unite in a moral crusade against Russian despotism." ‡

\* Cobden's "Political Writings," pp. 273-4.

† Stepniak, vol. ii. p. 280.

‡ *Ibid.* pp. 283-5.



## ART. VIII.—GEORGE ELIOT.

*George Eliot's Life, as related in her Letters and Journals.*  
Arranged and Edited by her husband, J. W. CROSS. Edinburgh. 1885.

"WITH the materials in my hands," says Mr. Cross in his brief Preface, "I have endeavoured to form an *autobiography* (if the term may be permitted) of George Eliot. The life has been allowed to write itself in extracts from the letters and the journals. Free from the obtrusion of any mind but her own, this method serves, I think, better than any other open to me, to show the development of her intellect and character."

"In dealing with the correspondence, I have been influenced by the desire to make known the woman, as well as the author, through the presentation of her daily life."

"On the intellectual side there remains little to be learnt by those who already know George Eliot's books. In the twenty volumes which she wrote and published in her lifetime, will be found her best and ripest thoughts. The letters now published throw light on another side of her nature—not less important, but hitherto unknown to the public—the side of the affections."

"The intimate life was the core of the root from which sprung the fairest flowers of her inspiration. Fame came to her late in life, and, when it presented itself, was so weighted with the sense of responsibility that it was in truth a rose with many thorns, for George Eliot had the temperament that shrinks from the position of a public character. The belief in the wide, and I may add in the beneficent, effect of her writings was no doubt the highest happiness, the reward of the artist which she greatly cherished: but the joys of the hearth-side, the delight in the love of her friends, were the supreme pleasures of her life."

"By arranging all the letters and journals so as to form one connected whole, keeping the order of their dates, and with the least possible interruption of comment, I have endeavoured to combine a narrative of day-to-day life with the play of light and shade which only letters, written in various moods, can give, and without which no portrait can be a good likeness. I do not know that the particular method in which I have treated the letters has ever been adopted before. Each letter has been pruned of everything that seemed to me irrelevant to my purpose—of everything that I thought my wife would have wished to be omitted. Every sentence that remains, adds, in my

judgment, something (however small it may be) to the means of forming a conclusion about her character."

The first few words of this programme are liable to raise hopes destined only to speedy disappointment. A full collection of George Eliot's letters, with extracts from her journals and private memoranda—a collection arranged in proper order, and linked together almost into a narrative by the discreet adjunction of a few explanatory notes—what could be more desirable? It would be preferable even to an autobiography, for an autobiography is generally a studied painting, composed from memory at a distance of many years from the real scenes, whereas a correspondence may rather be likened to a series of photographic views taken on the spot and at the time. The greater fidelity of trait is more than compensation for the lack of artistic composition. But alas! this simple reproduction of old letters, with their faded ink and yellowish-tinged paper, is very far from the "particular method" adopted by Mr. Cross. He has "pruned" the precious relics in his hands—pruned them of everything that either seemed irrelevant to his own purpose, or that his wife, according to his judgment, would have wished to be omitted. He tells us, with something like complacency, that no single letter has been printed in its entirety! As well might the proprietor of a collection of antique marbles introduce the public into his gallery with the assurance that not a statue has been suffered to remain unclothed! We do not quarrel with Mr. Cross, for neither do we doubt his perfect rectitude of purpose nor have we any means of judging with what discretion his scruples may have been carried out, but we cannot hinder the melancholy reflection that the very passages which the author of a correspondence is likely to expunge, are precisely those which would be of most interest to posterity. And if this be true of autobiographers in general, how much more so of George Eliot! A woman whose quivering susceptibilities were such as to be disturbed by a rose-leaf lying the wrong way; who not only shrouded her early authorship in mystery, but, even when unparalleled success had been achieved, trembled at each new undertaking lest it should not be found equal to the last; a woman to whom the warmest sympathy was as the breath of life, and criticism as malaria; who was so anxious to be known only at her best that only once in her life could she be induced to sit to a photographer, and then speedily repented of it—such a woman would be likely to consign an entire library to the flames, rather than suffer one line of writing to escape which might become the basis of an unfavourable judgment.

The dismal forebodings thus aroused by the Preface are but too well confirmed by the sequel. In truth, Mr. Cross must have

had a hard time of it, and it is no wonder if the result of his selection is at least as remarkable for what it omits as for what it contains. It is difficult, of course, to estimate the former, but there was at least one period of George Eliot's life during which she was a ready correspondent, and, to judge from the number of blanks left in this, the total amount sacrificed must be very considerable. Of her early relation to her family; of the dissensions that arose, and the treatment she received, at the time when a change first came over her religious beliefs; of the manner and the phases of that change; of her life in London at the interesting period of her connection with *THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW*; of the part she took in that great intellectual stir, and especially of the judgments she passed on the many highly remarkable men with whom she was then thrown into close contact, no record worth mentioning is made. As it is highly improbable that none should have been found, we can only assume that it has been suppressed. So completely has the well-known proverb respecting the dead, been made to extend its protection to the living, that one slightly critical remark upon Disraeli ("the man hath good veins, as Bacon would say, but there is not enough blood in them") is about all that we can quote, after perusal of these volumes, as a dictum upon contemporaries. Such reticence can bear but one interpretation. Being given George Eliot's passionate temperament, her quick and deep responsiveness to all impressions, her piercing observation, her power of scathing satire and of cold unmerciful analysis, her capabilities of attachment, and, on the other hand, her capabilities of indignation and reproof, it is not credible that she should have rested content, in her letters to intimate friends, with such milk-and-water innocuousness of expression as her husband has preserved for us. Benignity was certainly one of the aspects of George Eliot's character, but no reader of her novels will believe that she was such a lamb as this correspondence would depict her. "A little more wickedness, if you please!" is what we are tempted to call for.

The same persistent exclusion of all intimate communication concerning the most interesting developments of George Eliot's life is noticeable throughout. We would not, however, seem ungrateful for what Mr. Cross has given us. Beggars mustn't be choosers, and half a loaf is better than no bread. The published portion of George Eliot's correspondence does not furnish a full picture; but there is still hope that it may be completed at some later period, and, at any rate, it shall be welcome such as it is. If Mr. Cross has not told the whole truth, he has at least told nothing but the truth. There now remains for us to turn over his pages with such of our readers as may be willing to join us

in this pleasant task, and comment, with the help of extracts from his extracts, upon the successive mental and moral phases of one of the most gifted and high-minded women that England ever has brought forth.

The first stage may be designated as the Evangelical, or the ascetic. Marian Evans had, from childhood upwards, been considered as the most pious member of her family. At Miss Wallington's school, to which Marian was sent as a boarder in her eighth or ninth year, she conceived a deep attachment for the principal governess, Miss Lewis, and this lady, who was an ardently Evangelical Churchwoman, and who remained for several years Marian's most intimate friend and principal correspondent, exerted, no doubt, a considerable influence over her pupil's religious development. From the fact that, during the four years or thereabouts which Marian spent at this school, the only intimacy she formed was this friendship with her teacher, it may be inferred how far this extraordinary girl was already in advance of her natural companions. Her development, both physical and mental, was indeed extremely precocious. One of her school-fellows, who knew her at the age of thirteen, is reported to have said that it was impossible for her to conceive Marian Evans as a baby; that it seemed as if she must have come into the world fully developed. Her features were fully formed at a very early age, and she had a seriousness of expression that was almost startling for her years. At thirteen, like her own Maggie Tulliver in "*The Mill on the Floss*," Marian had already the appearance, and probably also the consciousness, of a woman.

During the last three years of her school-life, which were spent under the direction of the Misses Franklin at Coventry, Marian's superiority over the girls of her own age continued to preclude such intimacy as would otherwise have been natural and necessary in a nature so full of sympathy as hers. She was, however, much admired and looked up to, and always took a prominent part in organizing prayer-meetings and religious exercises.

At the time when the published correspondence begins—that is to say, in August, 1838—Marian, then nearly nineteen years of age, was living alone with her father in their farmhouse at Griff, in Warwickshire. She had left the Misses Franklin at the Christmas term of 1835, and since, through the death of her mother in 1836, as well as the marriage of her eldest sister, Chrissie, in 1837, the entire charge of the household had devolved upon her. Mr. Evans, always tenderly considerate of his "little wench," had offered to engage a housekeeper, but his daughter had declined any such assistance, and, throwing herself into her work with accustomed energy and thoroughness, had soon

brought her department to a high pitch of perfection. She busied herself at the same time with visiting the poor, organizing clothing clubs and other works of active charity ; she continued to take lessons in Italian, German, music, and, besides all this, managed to get through a large amount of miscellaneous reading by herself. In the evening she was in the habit of playing the piano to her father, who was very fond of music. But, in spite of these determined efforts to fill up her life, Marian must have been dimly conscious of a great void within. Powerful as her mental organization was, her need of sympathy was still stronger. It was not enough for her to study, to observe, to meditate, unless she could do so with a companion. Throughout her correspondence, and even to the last days of her existence, this interchange is seen to be the cardinal need of her organism. Under such circumstances her life at Griff, though full of interest of its own, and affording the material from which George Eliot drew the most powerful and touching of her creations, could not be otherwise than monotonous, galling and depressing to her. There was no sympathetic soul near with whom she could converse and work out the problems of all kinds which were beginning to press upon her mind. Her solitude irritated and terrified her ; she doubtless had occasional visions of herself growing old in this remote farm place, and seeing year by year roll by without ever bringing her an opportunity to achieve those mighty and mysterious destinies which from earliest times had haunted her imagination. As she wrote many years later in "*Daniel Deronda*,"—"You may try, but you can never imagine what it is to have a man's force of genius in you, and yet to suffer the slavery of being a girl."

When a passionate hungry nature such as this is foiled in its search of a full life, it usually attempts to find comfort in complete renunciation. To these lovers of extremes, the next best thing to being immeasurably rich, is to be voluntarily and absolutely poor. Marian Evans was no exception to this rule. She threw herself into asceticism with all the ardour of her young repulsed ambitions. The pursuit of pleasure became a snare, dress a vanity, society a danger. To quote her own words, she went about "like an owl," to the great disgust of her brother, and would have denied him the most lawful amusements. She took, at about this time, a trip to London with her brother Isaac ; but she, who in her earliest years had followed him about like a little dog, fishing with him, spinning tops, and digging for earth-nuts, thought it her duty now to stand aloof, and spend her evenings alone at the hotel, reading, while Isaac visited the theatres. Her tendency to proselytizing (for so sociable a nature could not but desire to impress her own beliefs and feel-



ings upon others) must have produced no little disturbance in the small family circle. We may apply to Marian Evans, at this crisis, what she afterwards wrote of Maggie Tulliver :

From what you know of her, you will not be surprised that she threw some exaggeration and wilfulness, some pride and impetuosity, even into her self-renunciation : her own life was still a drama for her, in which she demanded of herself that her part should be played with intensity. And so it came to pass that she often lost the spirit of humility by being excessive in the outward act ; she often strove after too high a flight, and came down with her poor little half-fledged wings dabbled in the mud. . . . That is the path we all like when we set out on our abandonment of egoism—the path of martyrdom and endurance, when the palm branches grow, rather than the steep highway of tolerance, just allowance and self-blame, where there are no leafy honours to be gathered and worn.

Was she happy, at least, in this endeavour after self-repression ? The evidence points strongly to the negative. Doubtless, she knew some moments of heavenly reward, but, on the whole, the hours of despondency and discontent must have been woefully predominant. The religious element in Marian Evans, genuine and deep-set as it was, was not sufficiently exclusive of other vital needs to draw all sustenance unto itself. Her nature was too rich, too many-sided, to abide by a course which bore no reference to any other wants but one. The self-renouncing impulses of one moment were checkmated at another by an eager desire for approbation and pre-eminence ; her piety did not exclude a very clear perception of the advantage and desirability of good birth, wealth, and high social position.

We will now proceed to give a few extracts from the letters of this period :—

*To Miss Lewis, Aug. 18, 1838.*—For my part, when I hear of the marrying and giving in marriage that is constantly being transacted, I can only sigh for those who are multiplying earthly ties which, though powerful enough to detach their hearts and thoughts from heaven, are so brittle as to be liable to be snapped asunder at every breeze. You will think that I need nothing but a tub for my habitation to make me a perfect female Diogenes ; and I plead guilty to occasional misanthropical thoughts, but not to the indulgence of them. Still I must believe that those are happiest who are not fermenting themselves by engaging in projects for earthly bliss, who are considering this life merely a pilgrimage, a scene calling for diligence and watchfulness, not for repose and amusement. I do not deny that there may be many who can partake with a high degree of zest of all the lawful enjoyments the world can offer, and yet live in near communion with their God—who can warmly love the creature and yet be careful that the Creator maintains His supremacy in their hearts ; but I confess that in my short experience and narrow sphere of action,

I have never been able to attain to this. I find, as Dr. Johnson said respecting his wine, total abstinence much easier than moderation. I do not wonder you are pleased with Pascal; his thoughts may be returned to the palate again and again with increasing rather than diminished relish. I have highly enjoyed Hannah More's letters: the contemplation of so blessed a character as hers is very salutary. "That ye be not slothful, but followers of them who, through faith and patience, inherit the promises," is a valuable admonition. I was once told that there was nothing out of myself to prevent my becoming as eminently holy as St. Paul; and though I think that is too sweeping an assertion, yet it is very certain we are generally too low in our aims, more anxious for safety than for sanctity, for place than purity, forgetting that each involves the other, and that, as Doddridge tells us, to rest satisfied with any attainments in religion is a fearful proof that we are ignorant of the very first principles of it. Oh that we could live only for eternity! that we could realize its nearness! I know you do not love quotations, so I will not give you one; but if you do not distinctly remember it, do turn to the passage in Young's "Infidel Reclaimed," beginning, "O vain, vain, vain all else eternity," and do love the lines for my sake.

The above extract is extremely characteristic, but we hasten to add that perhaps no other in the whole collection conveys so unfavourable a picture of the writer. In the first place, the letter is pre-eminently schoolgirlish, as may be seen, for instance, from the adjuration at its close. There would be nothing unnatural in this, seeing that Miss Evans had not yet attained her nineteenth anniversary; it would only tend to show that Marian's mental growth was not so far beyond her age as might have been surmised from the precocity of her physical development and bearing. Unfortunately, the letter in question displays none of the more pleasing aspects of juvenility; it is studied in style, formal in manner, didactic and preachifying in tone. It is not the simple outpouring of one heart into another, but rather the elaborate composition of an epistle, intended to pass from hand to hand, and conduce to the edification of many. It savours strongly of literary ambition and future essayism, as for instance in the alliteration of "safety" and "sanctity," "place" and "purity," and in the expression that Pascal's thoughts may be "returned to the palate again and again with increasing rather than diminished relish." It is difficult to repress the notion that our youthful moralist was occupied at this moment much more with self than with her best-loved friend; that her sighs over earthly vanities were not without complacency, that she put in her literary touches with a careful pen, and read her letter over before she posted it. And this brings us to the principal point in our comment—namely, that the religious feeling expressed by Miss Evans at this stage, was decidedly wanting in

depth and in originality. We do not mean that it was not genuine ; we only mean that it had not vitality enough to break through the conventional in its expression. There is nothing, either in this or in the following letters, which transcends the ordinary level of religious earnestness. A young lady who stops to quote Doddridge in support of her innermost convictions, has either not plunged very deep, or is rapidly rising to the surface.

Here is another fragment of about the same period :—

*To Miss Lewis, Nov. 6, 1838.*—I have just begun the “Life of Wilberforce,” and I am expecting a rich treat from it. There is a similarity, if I may compare myself with such a man, between his temptations, or rather *besetments*, and my own, that makes his experience very interesting to me. Oh that I might be made as useful in my lowly and obscure station as he was in the exalted one assigned to him ! I feel myself to be a mere cumberer of the ground. May the Lord give me such an insight into what is truly good, that I may not rest contented with making Christianity a mere addendum to my pursuits, or with tacking it as a fringe to my garments ! May I seek to be sanctified wholly ! My nineteenth birthday will soon be here—an awakening signal. My mind has been much clogged lately by languor of body, to which I am prone to give way, and for the removal of which I shall feel thankful.

We have had an oratorio at Coventry lately, Braham, Phillips, Mrs. Knyvett and Mrs. Shaw—the last, I think, I shall attend. I am not fitted to decide on the question of the propriety or lawfulness of such exhibitions of talent and so forth, because I have no soul for music. “Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth.” I am a tasteless person, but it would not cost me any regrets if the only music heard in our land were that of strict worship, nor can I think a pleasure that involves the devotion of all the time and powers of an immortal being to the acquirement of an expertness in so useless (at least in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred) an accomplishment, can be quite pure or elevating in its tendency.

Mr. Cross thinks the preceding passage all the more surprising because only two years later, when Miss Evans attended the Birmingham Festival of September, 1840, she was affected by the music to the extent of violent hysterical sobbing. He adds that music, and especially oratorio, was one of her chiefest delights throughout all her later life. But the difficulty of reconciling these apparent incongruities is not, perhaps, as great as it may seem. In the first place, the extract above quoted must evidently be taken with a grain of allowance. It was probably written in one of those fits of despondency to which Miss Evans, especially at this period of her life, was pre-eminently subject, and in which the “weight of this mysterious world” threatened to become too much for her. Such periods of reaction are the

usual penalty of overstrung and over-sensitive organizations. In the second place, we imagine that Miss Evans may have belonged to the numerous class of those who value music as a means of stimulating certain emotional or ideational states (frequently religious), rather than to the category of genuine musicians who love music for itself. Her hysterical sobbing at the Birmingham Festival is quite of a nature to confirm this supposition. It points, not to the power of the music, but to the power of some personal preoccupation, some absorbing retrospection or presentiment, which the music had simply set a-going. It is thus, for instance, that in Goethe's "Faust," Gretchen faints away on hearing the organ in the church. This species of sensibility to music is frequently found in persons of strong ideality. We remember having read somewhere of John Stuart Mill, that he was drawn to music by finding it conducive to his favourite contemplation—the apotheosis of humanity in a far future period of enlightenment and goodness. Professor Gervinus, who devoted a large portion of his life to the cultivation of Handel's compositions (he wrote an elaborate parallel between Handel and Shakespeare), asserted distinctly that music *without words* was a mere tickling of the ear, deserving of nothing but bare tolerance. Now, it is certain that Professor Gervinus, throughout his career, derived very considerable enjoyment from music, but it was an enjoyment in which music served chiefly as an intermediary. Something similar may have been the case with George Eliot. One of her favourite emotional states was doubtless the religious; it maintained throughout life the hold which it had acquired in her earlier years, and music may have become all the more precious as a means of re-entering this world of her youth, when the key of religious belief had ceased to open it. In limiting music to its function in the church, Miss Evans may simply have meant to banish what Professor Gervinus, in *his* language, would have described as music without words.

The difference between George Eliot and a really musical novelist may be felt by comparing her novels to those, for instance, of George Sand.

The next extract is from a letter to an aunt, Mrs. Samuel Evans, a former Methodist preacher, who afterwards became, at least in some respects, the original of Dinah in "Adam Bede":

*March, 1839.*—The unprofitableness you lament in yourself, during your visit to us, had its true cause, not in your lukewarmness, but in the little improvement I sought to derive from your society, and in my lack of humility and Christian simplicity, that makes me willing to obtain credit for greater knowledge and deeper feeling than I really possess. Instead of putting my light under a bushel, I am in danger of ostentatiously displaying a false one. You have much too high an

opinion, my dear aunt, of my spiritual condition, and of my personal and circumstantial advantages. My soul seems for weeks together completely benumbed, and when I am aroused from this torpid state, the intervals of activity are comparatively short. I am ever finding excuses for this in the deprivation of outward excitement and in the small scope I have for the application of my principles, instead of feeling self-abasement under the consciousness that I abuse precious hours of retirement which would be eagerly employed in spiritual exercises by many a devoted servant of God who is struggling with worldly cares and occupations. I feel that my besetting sin is the one of all others most destroying, as it is the fruitful parent of them all—ambition, a desire insatiable for the esteem of my fellow-creatures. This seems the centre whence all my actions proceed. But you will perhaps remember, my dear aunt, that I do not attach much value to a disclosure of religious feelings, owing probably to the dominant corruption I have just been speaking of, which “turns the milk of my good purpose all to curd.”

The next letter to the above, in Mr. Cross's collection, is mainly a rather pompous and pretentious disquisition as to whether novel-reading be permissible. It is too lengthy for quotation here; but its prohibitory tendency, and the style of argument by which that tendency is supported, may be gathered from the following lines:

If it be said the mind must have relaxation, “truth is strange—stranger than fiction.” When a person has exhausted the wonders of truth, there is no other resort than fiction; till then, I cannot imagine how the adventures of some phantom, conjured up by fancy, can be more entertaining than the transactions of real specimens of human nature from which we may safely draw inferences. I dare say Mr. James's “Huguenot” would be recommended as giving an idea of the times of which he writes, but as well may one be recommended to look at landscapes for an idea of English scenery. The real secret of the relaxation talked of is one that would not generally be avowed; but an appetite that wants seasoning of a certain kind cannot be indicative of health. Religious novels are more hateful to me than merely worldly ones: they are a sort of centaur or mermaid, and like other monsters that we do not know how to class, should be destroyed nor the public good as soon as born. The weapons of the Christian warfare were never sharpened at the forge of romance. Domestic fictions, as they come more within the range of imitation, seem more dangerous. For my part, I am ready to sit down and weep at the impossibility of my understanding or barely knowing a fraction of the sum of objects that present themselves for our contemplation in books and in life. Have I, then, any time to spend on things that never existed?

Surely the contrast between juvenile theory and riper practice was never more strikingly expressed. We do not know that there has ever existed a youthful Beethoven expressing his

dislike to music, an adolescent Dante demonstrating the futility of poetry, a stripling Rembrandt dogmatizing upon the vanity of painting; but here we have a George Eliot—a woman destined not only to take rank with the greatest novelists of any age, but destined to regard this work of hers in the light of a priesthood, to expect from it a far-reaching influence on nations, and to be content with nothing short of this—here we have this woman gravely arguing at twenty that novel-reading betokens an unhealthy appetite; that it can serve no purpose which would not be better served in other ways; that if worldly novels be already bad, religious novels are still worse, and domestic fictions most dangerous of all; that all such monsters should for the public good be strangled in their cradle; that the only worthy literary forge is that at which the weapons of Christian warfare may be sharpened; and that the only fitting use of hours of retirement is to spend them in spiritual exercises.

Nor can it be objected that the argument is directed only against light literature of an inferior stamp. Miss Evans, in a preceding portion of her letter, does indeed make an exception for such "standard works whose contents are matter of constant reference, and the names of whose heroes and heroines briefly, and therefore conveniently, describe characters and ideas." This would include "Don Quixote," "Hudibras," "Robinson Crusoe," "Gil Blas," Byron's Poetical Romances (!), Southey's ditto, and also Walter Scott's novels and poems. But this tolerance, be it observed, is simply grounded on the expediency, for persons in society, to understand such common allusions as "He is a perfect Dominie Sampson;" "He is as industrious in finding out antiquities as Jonathan Oldbuck;" it does not touch the root of the general prohibition, which is, that it is better to study real objects than any more or less imaginative representation of them. This principle, which reminds one of the Mahomedan restriction in architecture, would logically involve the condemnation of the fine arts generally, since a painting or a piece of statuary is just as much an imaginative reproduction of real forms as a good novel is of character. Fortunate, indeed, that there is enough vitality in human nature to prevent such gloomy phantasies from being fully carried out. No more cakes and ale; no merriment nor play; a world in which even the gentle ties of family would be avoided, and in which the main pre-occupation of each inhabitant would be to prepare himself for his escape at the earliest moment compatible with Divine command! No wonder that, with such conceptions working in her brain, Miss Evans found herself for weeks together "totally benumbed," her state of torpor yielding only for brief intervals to periods of activity.

The reaction came. In March, 1841, Mr. Evans removed from Griff to Foleshill Road, near Coventry, and his daughter was thus brought within the genial influence of the Hennells and the Brays. We cannot but believe that so powerful a mind as Marian's would have found its outlet without extraneous help, but the process of emancipation was doubtless rendered much more rapid and less painful through the instrumentality of highly intellectual and sympathetic intercourse. Mr. Charles Bray was a well-to-do ribbon manufacturer, who had availed himself of the considerable leisure left him by his business, to acquire much liberal culture and mental development. He had already published in 1839 a work on the "Education of the Feelings" (viewed from the phrenological standpoint, to which he remained steadfastly attached), and now, two years later, his most important book, "The Philosophy of Necessity," had just appeared. His wife, Caroline; his brother-in-law, Mr. Charles Hennell, who had published in 1838 a remarkable "Inquiry concerning the Origin of Christianity;" his sister-in-law, Miss Sara Hennell, a future authoress, who was one of George Eliot's most intimate friends; and finally, Mr. Bray's sister, Mrs. Pears, through whom the acquaintance with Miss Evans was begun—completed a circle that seems to have been as cordial and lovable as it was intellectually stimulating. Miss Evans was drawn into it at the period of its highest mental activity, and she expanded rapidly under its influence, like a young plant that has at last struck a congenial soil. Mr. Cross shows good reason for believing that the change in Marian's creed had already been begun in August, 1840, by her reading Isaac Taylor's "Ancient Christianity and the Oxford Tracts," but Mr. Hennell's book had at any rate a very large share also in her revolution. The date at which she first acknowledged to herself that her opinions had undergone a radical change, is indicated with sufficient accuracy by the following letter to Miss Lewis:—

November 13, 1841.—My whole soul has been engrossed in the most interesting of all inquiries for the last few days, and to what result my thoughts may lead, I know not—possibly to one that will startle you; but my only desire is to know the truth, my only fear to cling to error. I venture to say our love will not decompose under the influence of separation, unless you excommunicate me for differing from you in opinion. Think—is there any *conceivable* alteration in me that would prevent your coming to me at Christmas? I long to have a friend such as you are, I think I may say, alone to me, to unburthen every thought and difficulty—for I am still a solitary, though near a city. But we have the universe to talk with, infinity in which to stretch the gaze of hope, and an all-bountiful, all-wise

Creator in whom to confide,—He who has given us the untold delights of which our reason, our emotion, our sensations are the ever-springing sources.

The expression, “for the last few days,” which occurs at the beginning of this extract, would seem to imply that the change was a rapid one; but it is impossible to measure the duration of such processes by the length of time during which we are cognizant of them. The destruction of a belief is often carried on in the silent hidden way which characterizes the excavations of the termites; it is not until the once solid beams have been reduced to the thickness of an eggshell that the edifice is perceived to be in danger. Possibly, also, Miss Evans was unwilling to inform her friend of all that had been going on of late without her knowledge. Miss Lewis was evidently receding rapidly towards the background.

The following extract of a letter to Mrs. Pears is dated February, 1842:—

I can rejoice in all the joys of humanity,—in all that serves to elevate and purify feeling and action; nor will I quarrel with the million who, I am persuaded, are with me in intention, though our dialects differ. Of course, I must desire the ultimate downfall of error, for no error is innocuous; but this assuredly will occur without my proselytizing aid, and the best proof of a real love of the truth—that freshest stamp of divinity—is a calm confidence in its intrinsic power to secure its own high destiny—that of universal empire. Do not fear that I will become a stagnant pool by a self-sufficient determination only to listen to my own echo; to read the yea, yea on my own side, and be most comfortably deaf to the nay, nay. Would that all rejected *practically* this maxim! To *fear* the examination of any proposition appears to me an intellectual and moral palsy that will ever hinder the firm grasping of any substance whatever. For my part, I wish to be among the ranks of that glorious crusade that is seeking to set Truth’s holy sepulchre free from a usurped domination. We shall then see her resurrection! Meanwhile, although I cannot rank among my principles of action a fear of vengeance eternal, gratitude for predestined salvation, or a revelation of future glories as a reward, I fully participate in the belief that the only heaven, here or hereafter, is to be found in conformity with the will of the Supreme; a continual aiming at the attainment of the perfect ideal, the true *logos* that dwells in the bosom of the one Father. I hardly know whether I am ranting after the fashion of one of the Primitive Methodist prophetesses, with a cart for her rostrum, I am writing so fast.

The latter doubt is not without some warrant, and, at any rate, it needs no prophetess to foresee that the somewhat magniloquent ardour of this young crusader will be productive of disagreeable consequences at home. Mr. Cross writes:—“It was



impossible for such a nature as Miss Evans's, in the enthusiasm of this first great change, to rest satisfied in compliance with the old forms, and she was so uneasy in an equivocal position that she determined to give up going to church. This was an unforgivable offence in the eyes of her father, who was a churchman of the old school, and nearly led to a family rupture. He went so far as to put into an agent's hands the lease of the house in the Foleshill Road, with the intention of going to live with his married daughter. Upon this, Miss Evans made up her mind to go into lodgings at Leamington, and try to support herself by teaching." She did indeed leave her father's house for a few weeks, going to stay with her brother Isaac and his wife at Griff, in the old homestead ; but friends intervened, Mr. Evans was induced to reconsider his determination, and after a while Marian resumed her post, going to church as before. The correspondence, which is extremely scant about these matters, gives us no means of judging whether the old tenderness of relationship was ever completely restored ; but Marian remained henceforth with her father until his death, and attended him with great devotion in his last illness. In after-life she much regretted this temporary collision with her father, and thought that it might have been avoided by a little management, but she does not seem to have attributed to herself any other degree of blame, a point on which some readers will probably be disposed to differ from her. To us it seems that, in such cases, the duty of preserving the family peace devolves almost wholly upon the member who ceases to regard as binding the practices which are still paramount obligations to the rest. Apart from the question of filial deference, which alone would have great weight, there can be no equivalence of claim between the believer who looks upon certain observances as sacred and the sceptic who looks upon them as indifferent. It will be said, of course, that an observance cannot be indifferent so long as it is considered equivalent to the confession of a belief ; but we think that this inference can be guarded against in other ways, and at any rate that the duty of preventing any possible misconception on this score is far less imperative than that of sparing deep offence and pain to those whose love has nurtured our childhood.

At any rate, if Miss Evans cannot wholly be acquitted of intolerance and self-assertion during the first few months of her emancipation, she soon attained a higher platform. In October, 1843, we find her writing to Miss Sara Hennell as follows :—

The first impulse of a young and ingenuous mind is to withhold the slightest sanction from all that contains even a mixture of supposed error. When the soul is just liberated from the wretched giant's bed

of dogmas on which it has been racked and stretched ever since it began to think, there is a feeling of exultation and strong hope. We think we shall run well when we have the full use of our limbs and the bracing air of independence, and we believe that we shall soon obtain something positive which will not only more than compensate us for what we have renounced, but will be so well worth offering to others, that we may venture to proselytize as fast as our zeal for truth may prompt us. But a year or two of reflection, and the experience of our own miserable weakness, which will ill afford to part even with the crutch of superstition, must, I think, effect a change. Speculative truth begins to appear but a shadow of individual minds. Agreement between intellects seems unattainable, and we turn to the *truth of feeling* as the only universal bond of union. We find that the intellectual errors which we once fancied were a mere incrustation have grown into the living body, and that we cannot in the majority of cases wrench them away without destroying vitality. We begin to find that with individuals, as with nations, the only safe revolution is one arising out of the want which their own progress has generated. It is the quackery of infidelity to suppose that it has a nostrum for all mankind, and to say to all and singular, "Swallow my opinions and you shall be whole."

We have already had occasion to express our regret that the correspondence, as published by Mr. Cross, should throw so very little light upon the details of George Eliot's religious development at this time. One reason of this deficiency may be that she lived too much in oral intercourse with the persons, who most interested her, to make her feel the want of expressing her doubts and difficulties by letter. We are thus debarred from learning by what process her scepticism was first aroused and through what phases of belief she passed. It seems probable, however, that the overthrow of her old creed was effected by the *historical* rather than by the *ratiocinative* method. This point is one of great interest. The Christian dogma may be questioned in two ways: the dogma may be taken such as it is, and examined in the light of pure reason; or its origin, its credentials may be tested, in the light of historical research. Of these two methods—both of them legitimate, both of them conclusive, and both of them independent of each other—the former requires nothing but sound sense, with a fearless, dispassionate attitude of mind, whereas the latter necessitates a ponderous baggage of erudition, the knowledge of dead languages, the power and the patience to sift and to compare a mass of confused and often conflicting evidence. Under these circumstances, it may seem strange that the simpler, more expeditious route should not prove the more inviting, especially to a woman; but Miss Evans appears to have neglected it, or, at least, applied

it with very indifferent success until she had become a learned theologian.

The next few years may now be rapidly passed over. From the beginning of 1844 to April, 1846, Miss Evans is engaged on the translation of Strauss's "*Leben Jesu*," a work which had been begun by Miss Brabant, but relinquished by that young lady upon her marriage to Mr. Charles Hennell. Miss Evans achieved distinction by her excellent translation, but received no other adequate reward, as the pay was only £20 and twenty-five copies of the book. But the labour did her good, and her letters henceforth indicate a more healthful, cheerful tone of mind. Her ethical sense, far from being weakened by the change in her beliefs, had been raised and strengthened; for one day at Rosehill, Mr. Bray having made some remark on the beneficial influence exercised by evangelical beliefs on the moral feelings, Miss Evans said energetically: "I say it now, and I say it once for all, that I am influenced in my own conduct at the present time by far higher considerations, and by a nobler idea of duty, than I ever was while I held the evangelical beliefs." She writes to Miss Sara Hennell in November, 1847:

I think "Live and teach" should be a proverb as well as "Live and learn." We must teach each other for good or evil; and if we use our inward light as the Quaker tells us, always taking care to feed and trim it well, our teaching must in the end be for good. We are growing old together—are we not? I am growing happier too. I am amusing myself with thinking of the prophecy of Daniel as a sort of allegory. All those monstrous, "rombustical" beasts with their horns—the horn with eyes and a mouth speaking proud things, and the little horn that waxed rebellious and stamped on the stars, seem like my passions and vain fancies, which are to be knocked down one after the other—until all is subdued into a universal kingdom, over which the Ancient of Days presides—the spirit of love—the Catholicism of the Universe—if you can attach any meaning to such a phrase. It has a meaning for my sage noddle.

And again, in June, 1848, to the same correspondent:—

All creatures about to moult, or to cast off an old skin, or enter on any new metamorphosis, have sickly feelings. It was so with me. But now I am set free from the irritating worn-out integument. I am entering on a new period of my life, which makes me look back on the past as something incredibly poor and contemptible. I am enjoying repose, strength, and ardour in a greater degree than I have ever known, and yet I never felt my own insignificance and imperfection so completely. My heart bleeds for dear father's pains, but it is blessed to be at hand to give the soothing word and act needed. I should not have written this description of myself but that I felt your affectionate letter demanded some I-ism, which, after all, is often humility rather than pride.

Mr. Robert Evans died, after a long illness, on the 31st of May, 1849, and his daughter was so prostrated by the shock, as well as by antecedent fatigue and anxiety, that her friends, the Brays, determined to take her with them on a trip to the Continent. They started on the 11th of June, and, after visiting Paris, Lyons, Avignon, Marseilles, Nice, Genoa, Milan, Como, Lago Maggiore, Martigny, and Chamounix, arrived in the third week of July at Geneva. Here it was decided that Miss Evans should remain for some months, her friends, the Brays, returning home. She inhabited, in the first place, a *pension* called the Campagne Plongeon, and, in the second place, the home of a Genevese artist, M. d'Albert Durade, for whom and for whose wife George Eliot retained the warmest regard. These eight months at Geneva were probably among the happiest of George Eliot's life, and they certainly have contributed the pleasantest portion of her correspondence. For the first time, her mind seems to *unbend*; the subjects she treats are less exclusively lofty; the style of her letters becomes more easy and chatty. It must be admitted, we think, that Miss Evans has not appeared hitherto in the light of what the French call "*une personne facile à vivre*." There is too much strain about her, too much ambition, too much introspection and self-preoccupation, too much pride and too much humility, too much boiling and bubbling of the volcanic springs that have not yet found a proper vent. At Geneva she rests awhile, as in the convalescence after a brain fever, and is content to live simply in the present and relax the rigour of her self-exactions.

*To the Brays, July 27, 1849.*—About my comfort here, I find, no disagreeables, and have every physical comfort that I care about. The family seems well-ordered and happy. I have made another friend too—an elderly English lady, a Mrs. Locke, who used to live at Ryde—a pretty old lady, with plenty of shrewdness and knowledge of the world. She began to say very kind things to me in rather a waspish tone yesterday morning at breakfast. I liked her better at dinner and tea, and to-day we are quite confidential. I only hope she will stay—she is just the sort of person I shall like to have to speak to—not at all "*congenial*," but with a character of her own. The going down to tea bores me, and I shall get out of it as soon as I can, unless I can manage to have the newspapers to read. The American lady embroiders slippers—the mamma looks on and does nothing. The Marquis and his friends play at whist; the old ladies sew; and Madame says things so true that they are insufferable. She is obliged to talk to all, and cap their *niaiseries* with some suitable observation. She has been very kind and motherly to me. I like her better every time I see her. I have quiet and comfort—what more can I want to make me a healthy reasonable being once more? I will never go near

a friend again until I can bring joy and peace in my heart and in my face—but remember that friendship will be easy then.

Aug. 5, 1849.—My life here would be delightful if we could always keep the same set of people; but alas! I fear one generation will go and another come so fast that I shall not care to become acquainted with any of them. My good Mrs. Locke is not going, that is one comfort. She is quite a mother to me—helps me to buy my candles and do all my shopping,—takes care of me at dinner, and quite rejoices when she sees me enjoy conversation or anything else. The St. Germaines are delightful people—the Marquise really seems to me the most charming person I ever saw, with kindness enough to make the ultra-politeness of her manners quite genuine. She is very good to me and says of me, “Je m'intéresse vivement à Mademoiselle.” The Marquis is the most well-bred, harmless of men. He talks very little—every sentence seems a terrible gestation, and comes forth *fortissimo*; but he generally bestows one on me, and seems especially to enjoy my poor tunes (mind you, all these trivialities are to satisfy your vanity, not mine—because you are beginning to be ashamed of having loved me).

Aug. 20, 1849.—The dear Marquise is a truly devout Catholic. It is beautiful to hear her speak of the comfort she has in the confessional, for our *têtes-à-tête* have lately turned on religious matters. She says I am in a “*mauvaise voie sous le rapport de la religion. Peut-être vous vous marierez, et le mariage, chère amie, sans la foi religieuse ! . . .*” She says I have isolated myself by my studies, that I am too cold, and have too little confidence in the feelings of others towards me; that I do not believe how deep an interest she has conceived in my lot. . . . She took on her the office of *femme de chambre*, and drest my hair one day. She has abolished all my curls, and made two things stick out on each side of my head like those on the head of the Sphinx. All the world says I look infinitely better; so I comply, though to myself I seem uglier than ever, if possible. I am fidgeted to death about my boxes, and that tiresome man not to acknowledge the receipt of them.

Aug. 28, 1849.—This place looks more lovely to me every day—the lake, the town, the *campagnes* with their stately trees and pretty houses, the glorious mountains in the distance; one can hardly believe one's self on earth: one might live here and forget that there is such a thing as want or labour or sorrow. The perpetual effect of all this beauty has somewhat the effect of mesmerism or chloroform. I feel sometimes as if I were sinking into an agreeable state of numbness on the verge of unconsciousness, and seem to want well pinching to rouse me. . . . You know, or you do not know, that my nature is so chameleon-like, I shall lose all my identity unless you keep nourishing it with letters,—so pray write as much and as often as you can. It jumps admirably with my humour to live in two worlds at once in this way. I possess my dearest friends and my old environments in my thoughts—and another world of novelty and beauty in which I am actually moving—and my contrariety of disposition always makes

the world that lives in my thoughts the dearer of the two—the one in which I more truly dwell. So, after all, I enjoy my friends most when I am away from them. I shall not say so, though, if I should live to rejoice you six or seven months hence. Keep me for seven years longer, and you will find out the use of me, like all other pieces of trumpery.

Sept. 13, 1849.—My boxes arrived last Friday. The expense was 150 francs—perfectly horrible! Clearly I must give myself for food to the fowls of the air or the fishes of the lake. It is a consolation to a mind imbued with a lofty philosophy, that when one can get nothing to eat, one can still be eaten—the evil is only apparent. It is quite settled that I cannot stay at Plongeon; I must move into town. But alas! I must pay fr.200 per month. If I were there I should see more conversible people than here. . . . This house is like a birdcage set down in a garden. . . . The Baronne de Ludwigsdorff seems to have begun to like me very much, and is really kind; so you see Heaven sends kind souls, though by no means kindred ones. Poor Mrs. Locke is to write to me—has given me a little ring—says “Take care of yourself, my child—have some tea of your own—you’ll be quite another person if you get some introductions to clever people—you’ll get on well among a certain set,—that’s true.” It is her way to say, “that’s true,” after all her affirmations. She says, “You won’t find any kindred spirits at Plongeon, my dear.”

Sept. 20, 1849.—I am ashamed to fill sheets about myself, but I imagined that this was precisely what you wished. Pray correct my mistake, if it be one, and then I will look over the Calvin MSS., and give you some information of really general interest, suited to our mutual capacities. Madame de Ludwigsdorff is so good to me . . . petting me in all sorts of ways. She says if I like she will spend the winter after this at Paris with me, and introduce me to her friends there; but she does not mean to attach herself to me, because I shall never like her long. I shall be tired of her when I have sifted her, &c. She says I have more intellect than *morale*, and other things more true than agreeable; however, she is “greatly interested” in me—has told me her troubles and her feelings, she says, in spite of herself; for she has never been able before in her life to say so much even to her old friends. . . . Miss F. tells me that the first time she sat beside me at dinner she looked at me, and thought to herself, “That is a grave lady; I do not think I shall like her much;” but as soon as I spoke to her, and she looked into my eyes, she felt she could love me. Then she lent me a book written by her cousin—a religious novel—in which there is a fearful infidel who will not believe, and hates all who do, &c. Then she invited me to walk with her, and came to talk in my room; then invited me to go to the Oratoire with them, till I began to be uncomfortable under the idea that they fancied I was Evangelical, and that I was gaining their affection under false pretences; so I told Miss F. that I was going to sacrifice her good opinion, and confess my heresies. I quite expected from their manner and character that they would forsake me in horror, but they are as kind as ever.

In October, when the cold weather doubtless made the house at Plongeon feel more and more like a "birdcage set down in a garden," Miss Evans removed to M. d'Albert's. She says of it:—

I think I have at last found the very thing—I shall be the only lodger. The *appartement* is *assez joli*, with an alcove, so that it looks like a sitting-room in the daytime. The people—an artist of great respectability, and his wife, a most kind-looking ladylike person, with two boys, who have the air of being well educated. I shall live with them—that is, dine with them; breakfast in my own room. The terms are 150 francs a month, light included. M. and Mme. d'Albert are middle-aged, musical, and, I am told, have *beaucoup d'esprit*. I hope this will not exceed my means for four or five months. There is a nice large *salon*, and a good *salle à manger*. I am told that their society is very good.

Dec. 4, 1849.—My good friends here only change for the better. Mme. d'Albert is all affection; M. d'Albert is all delicacy and intelligence. The friends to whom they have introduced me are very kind in their attention. In fact, I want nothing but a little more money to feel more at ease about my fires, &c. I am in an atmosphere of love and refinement. Even the little servant Jeanne seems to love me, and does me good every time she comes into the room. I can say anything to M. and Mme. d'Albert. M. d'A. understands everything, and if Madame does not understand, she believes—that is, she seems always sure that I mean something edifying. She kisses me like a mother, and I am baby enough to find that a great addition to my happiness. *Au reste*, I am careful for nothing; I am a sort of supernumerary spoon, and there will be no damage to the set if I am lost. My heart-ties are not loosened by distance—it is not in the nature of ties to be so; and when I think of my loved ones as those to whom I can be a comforter, a help, I long to be with them again. Otherwise, I can only think with a shudder of returning to England. It looks to me like a land of gloom, of *ennui*, of platitude; but in the midst of all this it is the land of duty and affection, and the only ardent hope I have for my future life is to have given me some woman's duty—some possibility of devoting myself where I may see a daily result of pure calm blessedness in the life of another.

We think that George Eliot was never more mistaken in herself (she who was generally so wonderfully clear-sighted) than when she wrote the above sentence. Her nature was far from being of that kind which can find sufficient happiness in living for another. To speak the language of economists, she was, as regards devotion, much more of a consumer than a producer. Not but that she could, on occasion, perform a "woman's duty," tend a sick-bed, pour forth the consolations of sweet sympathy, and forget herself in ministering to those she loved.

All this she could do, but she could not do it long. The Self was too massive to be dispelled otherwise than temporarily, by the first *enthusiasm* of sacrifice. Perhaps, after all, Mme. de Ludwigsdorff was not far wrong when she said that Miss Evans had more intellect than *morale*. We mean that the intellectual needs were, on the whole, in the ascendant. They had been relatively subdued during this period of convalescence at Geneva, and hence, perhaps, the universal flow of sympathy which she elicited; but her strength is now rapidly returning, and henceforth she seems to require sympathy rather as the *condition* of her intellectual productiveness (this being the prime interest, the *raison d'être* of her existence) than as a happiness sufficient in itself.

*Feb. 15, 1850.*—If you saw the Jura to-day! The snow reveals its forests, ravines, and precipices, and it stands in relief against a pure blue sky. The snow is on the mountains only now, and one is tempted to walk all day, particularly when one lies in bed till ten, as your exemplary friend sometimes does. I have had no discipline, and shall return to you more of a spoiled child than ever. Indeed, I think I am destined to be so to the end—one of the odious swarm of voracious caterpillars, soon to be swept away from the earth by a tempest. I am getting better bodily. I have much less headache, but the least excitement fatigues me. Certainly, if one cannot have a malady to carry one off rapidly, the only sensible thing to do is to grow well and fat, and I believe I shall be driven to that alternative.

*March 1, 1850.*—The weather is so glorious that I think I may set out on my journey soon after the 15th. I am not quite certain yet that M. d'Albert will not be able to accompany me to Paris; in any case, a package of so little value will get along safely enough. I am so excited at the idea of the time being so near when I am to leave Geneva—a real grief—and see my friends in England—a perfectly overwhelming joy—that I can do nothing. I am frightened to think what an idle wretch I have become. And you all do not write me one word to tell me you long for me. I have a great mind to elope to Constantinople and never see any one any more!

Miss Evans returned to England, under M. d'Albert's kind escort, on March 23, 1850. Her first impression was one of great disappointment. Who does not remember the depression which attends the end of a holiday, the resumption of everyday tasks, and the feeling that a bright page of life has been turned for ever? The cordiality of the friends we have left has been heightened by the emotion of separation, and the welcome of the friends to whom we return falls below the pitch of our overwrought expectations. Add to this the cold, the damp, the leaden sky of an English March, and we shall not be surprised to find our heroine complaining that she has placed herself



irretrievably out of reach of Nature's brightest glories to shiver in a wintry flat. Oh! the dismal weather, and the dismal country, and the dismal people. It was some envious demon that drove her across the Jura. She is determined to sell everything she possesses, except a portmanteau and carpet-bag, and the necessary contents, and be a stranger and a foreigner on the earth for evermore. Alas! she wants her friends to scold her and make her good. She is "idle and naughty; sinking into heathenish ignorance and woman's frivolity."

The next sixteen months were spent chiefly with the Brays at Rosehill. In the latter part of 1850 Miss Evans wrote a review of Mackay's "Progress of the Intellect," and became acquainted with Mr. John Chapman, editor of the *THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW*. In September, 1851, she became assistant-editor of the *REVIEW* and went to stay as a boarder in Mr. and Mrs. Chapman's house in London. This marks the beginning of Miss Evans's literary work—a stirring period of intellectual activity, upon which the correspondence throws unfortunately very little light. She was brought into contact with most of the ablest writers and most advanced thinkers of the time—Carlyle, Herbert Spencer, Lewes, Harriet Martineau, Sir David Brewster, Professor Owen, Huxley, Louis Blanc, with many others, and this intercourse cannot but have had great interest and benefit for so observant and receptive a nature as Miss Evans's. But, either she was kept too busy by her editorial work (often interrupted by headaches) to write at all fully of her impressions and reflections, or else the more intimate, confidential portion of her letters has been suppressed. The following will give our readers an idea of what remains:—

*September, 1851.*—I don't know how long Miss Bremer will stay, but you need not wish to see her. She is to me equally unprepossessing to eye and ear. I never saw a person of her years who appealed less to my purely instinctive veneration. I have to reflect every time I look at her that she is really Frederica Bremer.

Fox is to write the article on the Suffrage, and we are going to try Carlyle for the Peerage, Ward refusing on the ground that he thinks the improvement of the physical condition of the people so all-important, that he must give all his energies to that. He says, "Life is a bad business, but we must make the best of it;" to which philosophy I say Amen.

I was introduced to Lewes the other day in Jeff's shop—a sort of miniature Mirabeau in appearance.

*Oct. 2, 1851.*—I have been reading Carlyle's "Life of Sterling" with great pleasure—not for its presentation of Sterling, but of Carlyle. There are racy bits of description in his best manner and exquisite touches of feeling. Little rapid characterizations of living men too—of Francis Newman, for example—"a man of fine university

and other attainments, of the sharpest cutting and most restlessly advancing intellect, and of the mildest pious enthusiast." There is an inimitable description of Coleridge and his eternal monologue—"To sit as a passive bucket and be pumped into, whether one like it or not, can in the end be exhilarating to no creature."

Mr. Grey thought the review "well done and in a kindly spirit," but thought there was not much in it—dreadfully true, since there was only his book. . . . Carlyle was very amusing the other morning to Mr. Chapman about the Exhibition. He has no patience with the Prince, and "that Cole" assembling Sawneys from all parts of the land, till you can't get along Piccadilly. He has been worn to death with bores all this summer, who present themselves by twos and threes in his study, saying, "Here we are," &c.

Jan. 21, 1852.—Harriet Martineau called on Monday morning with Mr. Atkinson. Very kind and cordial. I know her for her powers and industry, and should be glad to think highly of her. I have no doubt that she is fascinating when there is time for talk. . . . Last Monday I was talking and listening for two hours to Pierre Leroux—a dreamy genius. He belongs neither to the school of Proudhon, which represents Liberty only; nor to that of Louis Blanc, which represents Equality only; nor to that of Cabet, which represents Fraternity. Pierre Leroux's system is the *synthèse* which combines all three. He has found the true *pont* which is to unite the love of self with the love of one's neighbour. . . . "Est-ce que nous sommes faits pour chercher le bonheur? Est-ce là votre idée—dites-moi. Mais non—nous sommes faits, je pense, pour nous développer le plus possible. Ah, c'est ça." He is in utter poverty, going to lecture—*autrement il faut mourir*. Has a wife and children with him. He came to London in his early days, when he was twenty-five, to find work as a printer. All the world was in mourning for the Princess Charlotte. "Et moi, je me trouvais avoir *un habit vert-pomme*." So he got no work; went back to Paris; by hook or by crook founded the *Globe* journal; knew St. Simon; disagrees with him entirely, as with all other theorists except Pierre Leroux.

Broadstairs, July 21, 1852.—Do not be anxious about me—there is no cause. I am profiting, body and mind, from quiet walks and talks with Nature . . . picking up shells (not in the Newtonian sense, but literally); reading Aristotle, to find out what is the chief good, and eating mutton-chops, that I may have strength to pursue it. If you insist upon my writing about "Emotions," why, I must get up some expressly for the purpose. But I must own I would rather not, for it is the grand wish and object of my life to get rid of them as far as possible, seeing they have already had more than their share of my nervous energy.

Sept. 2, 1852.—Somehow my letters—except those which come under the inexorable imperative *must* (the "ought" I manage well enough to shirk)—will not get written. The fact is, I am in a croaking mood, and I am waiting and waiting for it to pass by, so if my pen croaks in spite of my resolutions to the contrary, please to

take no notice of it. Ever since I have come back, I have felt something like the madness which imagines that the four walls are contracting and going to crush me. . . . There is a great dreary article on the Colonies by my side asking for reading and abridgment, so I cannot go on scribbling—indeed, my hands are so hot and tremulous this morning that it will be better for you if I leave off.

*To Charles Bray, Sept. 18, 1852.*—Lewes called on me the other day and told me of a conversation with Prof. Owen, in which the latter declared his conviction that the cerebrum was not the organ of the mind, but the cerebellum rather. He founds on the enormous comparative size of brain in the grampus! The Professor has a huge anterior lobe of his own. What would George Combe say if I were to tell him? But every great man has his paradox, and that of the first anatomist of Europe ought to be a startling one.

We may take this occasion of remarking that the phrenological convictions of Mr. Bray seem to have left their mark upon George Eliot. The references to the form of the head, and especially that of the "anterior lobe," are frequent throughout the correspondence. She writes on one occasion that she feels sure that Hamlet must have had a square front lobe. It is generally found that believers in phrenology are themselves possessed of such a form of skull as will justify a favourable phrenological report, and George Eliot was no exception to this rule. Mr. Bray declared that her development "from brow to ear" was greater than any other recorded since the first Napoleon, and was so much impressed with the form of her head, generally, that in the early times of their acquaintance he took her up to London to have a cast taken of it. In a letter to Miss Lewis, dated February, 1842, Miss Evans states that, having had her propensities, sentiments, and intellect gauged a second time, she is pronounced to possess a large organ of "adhesiveness," a still larger one of "firmness," and as large of "conscientiousness," in all of which, we think, phrenology was not far wrong.

*Jan. 1853.*—I begin to feel for other people's wants and sorrows a little more than I used to. Heaven help us, said the old religion; the new one, from its very lack of that faith, will teach us all the more to help one another. Tell Sara she is as good as a group of spice islands to me: she wafts the pleasantest influences, even from a distance.

*Nov. 22, 1853.*—I begin this year (her thirty-fifth) more happily than I have done most years of my life. "Notre vraie destinée," says Comte, "se compose de résignation et d'activité," and I seem more disposed to both than I have ever been before. Let us hope that we shall both get stronger by the year's activity—calmer by its resignation. I know it may be just the contrary—don't suspect me of being a canting optimist. . . . I told Mr. Chapman

yesterday that I wished to give up my connection with the editorship of the "Westminster." . . . I shall find the question of supplies rather a difficult one this year, as I am not likely to get any money either for "Feuerbach" or for "The Idea of a Future Life," for which I am to have half profits =  $\frac{9}{16}$ !

To Mrs. Bray, 1854.—My troubles are purely psychical—self-dissatisfaction, and despair of achieving anything worth the doing. I can truly say they vanish into nothing, before any fear for the happiness of those I love. Thank you for letting me know how things are, for indeed I could not bear to be shut out from your anxieties. When I spoke of myself as an island, I did not mean that I was so exceptionally. We are all islands—

Each in his hidden sphere of joy or woe,  
Our hermit spirits dwell and roam apart.

And this seclusion is sometimes the most intensely felt at the very moment your friend is caressing you or soothing you. But this gradually becomes a source of satisfaction instead of repining. When we are young we think our troubles a mighty business—that the world is spread out expressly as a stage for the particular drama of our lives, and that we have a right to rant and foam at the mouth if we are crossed. I have done enough of that in my time. But we begin at last to understand that these things are important only to our own consciousness, which is but a globule of dew on a roseleaf that at mid-day there will be no trace of.

It was in the middle of this year (1854) that Miss Evans, then within four months of her thirty-fifth anniversary, united her life to that of George Henry Lewes. There is very little in the correspondence to prepare the reader for such event. "A sort of miniature Mirabeau in appearance," such, as we have seen, is George Eliot's first impression of her future husband. Further on we find: "Lewes, as always, genial and amusing. He has quite won my liking, in spite of myself." And again, a little later: "Mr. Lewes has quite won my regard, after having had a good deal of my vituperation. A man of heart and conscience, wearing a mask of flippancy." A short time before their union Mr. Lewes was in ill-health, and Miss Evans did some of his literary work for him. This, to an initiated reader, may be a sufficient warning of the impending event, but sufficient or not, the correspondence gives us nothing further.

The following letter to Mrs. Bray, dated September 4, 1855 (*i.e.*, more than thirteen months after the event), conveys the chief utterances of George Eliot's on the subject:

If there is one action or relation of my life which is and always has been profoundly serious, it is my relation to Mr. Lewes. It is, however, natural that you should mistake me in many ways, for not only are you unacquainted with Mr. Lewes's real character and

the course of his actions, but also it is several years now since you and I were much together, and it is possible that the modifications my mind has undergone may be quite in the opposite direction of what you imagine. No one can be better aware than yourself that it is possible for two people to hold different opinions on momentous subjects with equal sincerity, and an equally earnest conviction that their respective opinions are alone the truly moral ones. If we differ on the subject of the marriage laws, I at least can believe of you that you cleave to what you believe to be good, and I don't know of anything in the nature of your views that should prevent you from believing the same of me. *How far* we differ, I think we neither of us know, for I am ignorant of your precise views; and apparently you attribute to me both feelings and opinions which are not mine. We cannot set each other quite right in this matter in letters, but one thing I can tell you in a few words. Light and easily broken ties are what I neither desire theoretically nor could live for practically. Women who are satisfied with such ties do *not* act as I have done. That any unworldly, unsuperstitious person who is sufficiently acquainted with the realities of life can pronounce my relation to Mr. Lewes to be immoral, I can only understand by remembering how subtle and complex are the influences that mould opinion. But I *do* remember this: and I indulge in no arrogant or uncharitable thoughts about those who condemn us, even though we might have expected a somewhat different verdict. From the majority of persons, of course, we never looked for anything but condemnation.

Nearly five years later George Eliot wrote as follows to Mrs. Peter Taylor, who had committed the mistake, in an otherwise friendly letter, of addressing her as "Miss Evans":—

*April 1, 1861.*—It gave me pleasure to have your letter, not only because of the kind expressions of sympathy it contains, but also because it gives me an opportunity of telling you, after this lapse of years, that I remember gratefully how you wrote to me with generous consideration and belief at a time when most persons who knew anything of me were disposed (naturally enough) to judge me rather severely. Only a woman of rare qualities would have written to me as you did on the strength of the brief intercourse that had passed between us.

It was never a trial to me to have been cut off from what is called the world; and I think I love none of my fellow-creatures the less for it; still I must always retain a peculiar regard for those who showed me any kindness in word or deed at that time, when there was the least evidence in my favour. The list of those who did so is a short one, so that I can often and easily recall it.

For the last six years I have ceased to be "Miss Evans" for any one who has personal relations with me, having held myself under all the responsibilities of a married woman. I wish this to be distinctly understood, and when I tell you that we have a great boy of eighteen at home who calls me "mother," as well as two other boys, almost as

tall, who write to me under the same name, you will understand that the point is not one of mere egoism or personal dignity when I request that any one who has a regard for me will cease to speak of me by my maiden name.

We have placed these two letters together because they correct each other. In the former, we think that George Eliot expects too much of her "unworldly, unsuperstitious" contemporaries, and makes an insufficient allowance for the impress of conventionality even on the best minds; in the subsequent letter she recognizes that the evidence at first was so strongly against her, that it needed a woman of "rare qualities" to resist the current of adverse opinion. That the outcry and the scandal were very great, may be gathered (if indeed any doubt on the subject were admissible) from the fact that even the Brays were not quite steadfast in their allegiance.

There is no room in such an article as this for a disquisition upon the marriage ceremony. But the most elementary distinctions have been so generally overlooked in appreciating George Eliot's relation to Mr. Lewes, and the defence, even of her partisans, has often been so timid and retiring, that we would fain obtain permission for a short digression. The marriage contract has three aspects which it is of fundamental importance to distinguish: the *religious*, the *legal*, and the *ethical*. Public opinion is, of course, a combination of all three, but it is precisely on that account that the value of public opinion cannot be ascertained without an analysis of its constituent elements. Now, with respect to the *religious* aspect, it is sufficient to point out that if marriage be essentially a sacrament, and if no union be legitimate without the consecration of the priest, then nine-tenths of the civilized world must be outside the pale. For, not only will all "civil" marriages be void, but all religious marriages also, unless they have been performed by a *genuine* representative of the Divinity. But there are as many claimants to this genuineness as there are religions—nay, religious sects—and the priests of one Church are no priests at all in the eyes of another. George Eliot will certainly be among the outsiders, but her predicament will be no worse than that of the immense majority of mankind.

The *legal* aspect of the marriage ceremony is far more serious, but it evidently involves nothing more than a question of *prudence*, of *protection*. The woman who marries without the sanction of the law, deprives herself (and possibly her children) of the contingent right to certain legal remedy and redress. She is blameable for exposing herself (and perhaps others) to a risk which it was in her power to avoid; but her case is exactly similar in nature to that of a parent, or representative of a firm,

who should *pay money without taking a receipt* therefor, and her condemnation can rest only on the ground that, whether through ignorance or light-headedness, or excess of trust, she *neglected a precaution*.

It is evident, we think, from the foregoing that the case against Miss Evans (if such case there be) must chiefly rest upon the *ethical* aspect of her act. It is by this that the prosecution, as far as any high-toned judgment is concerned, must stand or fall. Now, we think it must become apparent to any one who will give candid attention to the matter that the issue, at the bar of ethics, must depend, not upon the legality, but upon the intrinsic merits of the union—*i.e.*, the genuine *intentions* of the contracting parties. A true marriage from the ethical point of view is one which is based upon true love, and contracted for the purpose of true and lasting fellowship; if it be this, the marriage is valid; if it be not this, the marriage is void, whatever its legality. No abundance of priestly blessings or of notarial seals can make a mere money match anything else but an act of prostitution; and, on the other hand, no lack of religious or legal formalities can prevent a marriage from being ethically sound, if only it be a union of a high order. We do not wish to underrate the value of all those conventional decrees and usages by which society has striven to fortify and preserve the institution of marriage. The very fact that these dictates exist, and that they are mistaken by many people for the dictates of nature, is sufficient evidence as to their importance; but we are speaking here, not of conventionality—the social code established for the government of the many—but of *morality*, that higher and more permanent code which is the last appeal of the individual conscience. It is not disputed that the marriage of George Eliot and of G. H. Lewes was a genuine marriage in the highest sense—nay, a pattern marriage!—that it was based on profound attachment and esteem; that it was effected not for a day but for a lifetime; that it not only lasted, but improved with age; that it was beneficial to both partners, and increased the capabilities of each for usefulness and happiness. On the other hand, there were no genuine rights of third parties to stand in the way, as Mr. Lewes's former marriage had virtually been dissolved nearly two years previously. Under these circumstances, the charge of immorality may surely be dismissed, however much there may remain to be said, on grounds of practical wisdom and expediency, against unions for which the social sanction cannot be obtained. The penalty of disregarding social laws is certain and severe; the benefit accruing from the transgression must always be contingent and problematical.

It was not until March, 1855, after a sojourn of over seven months in Germany, that Mr. and Mrs. Lewes returned to England. They had visited principally Weimar and Berlin, and Mr. Lewes had been engaged in re-writing his "Life of Goethe," while George Eliot produced a couple of review articles, such as that on "Madame de Sablé" for the WESTMINSTER, and nearly finished a translation of Spinoza's "Ethics." Although they were kindly received and made a few notable acquaintances, George Eliot's first impression of Germany and Germans seems to us rather supercilious; she says, for instance: "*Apropos of jokes, we noticed that during the whole seven months of our stay in Germany we never heard one witticism, or even one felicitous idea or expression from a German.*" And she sums up her experiences by entering in her journal, at Dover, that *after all (i.e., notwithstanding "questionable meat, stove-heated rooms, the noise and indiscriminate smoking of the inns, the want of taste and politeness on the part of the inhabitants") Germany is no bad place to live in.*"

A busy life now began for the newly married couple. Their means were slender, and Mr. Lewes had to provide not only for his three boys, but for their mother. Both he and George Eliot were thus compelled to work hard for what would bring immediate profit. They could afford but one sitting-room between them, and the scratching of another pen close to her would sometimes drive George Eliot almost wild with nervousness. She managed notwithstanding to accomplish much, writing not only the "Belles-Lettres" section for the WESTMINSTER, but also a number of her most brilliant articles, as well for the WESTMINSTER as for the *Leader*, *Fraser*, and *Saturday Review*. The following entries in her journal for 1855 will give an idea of her employments:

May 2.—Came to East Sheen, and settled in our lodgings.

June 13.—Began Part IV. of Spinoza's "Ethics." Began also to read Cumming, for article in the WESTMINSTER. We are reading in the evenings now Sydney Smith's Letters, Boswell, Whewell's "History of Inductive Sciences," the "Odyssey," and occasionally Heine's "Reisebilder." I began the second book of the "Iliad," in Greek, this morning.

June 21.—Finished article on Brougham's "Lives of Men of Letters."

June 23.—Read "Lucrezia Floriani." We are reading White's "History of Selborne" in the evening, with Boswell and the "Odyssey."

Dec. 24.—For the last ten days I have done little, owing to headache and other ailments. Began the "Antigone," read von Bohlen on Genesis, and Swedenborg.



The reading together in the evening remained one of George Eliot's favourite occupations, and she got through an enormous amount of literature in this manner. Thus, she writes to Miss Sara Hennell in February, 1856 :—

We are delighting ourselves with Ruskin's third volume. . . . I read it aloud for an hour or so after dinner; then we jump to the old dramatists, when Mr. Lewes reads to me as long as his voice will hold out, and after this we wind up the evening with Rymer Jones's "Animal Kingdom," by which I get a confused knowledge of branchiæ and such things—perhaps, on the whole, a little preferable to total ignorance. These are our *noctes*—without *cenæ* for the present—occasionally diversified by very dramatic singing of Figaro, &c., which, I think, must alarm "that good man, the clergyman," who sits below us.

In March, 1856, she writes to Mr. Bray :—

We are flourishing in every way except health. Mr. Lewes's head is still infirm, but he manages, nevertheless, to do twice as much work as other people. I am always a croaker, you know, but my ailments are of a small kind, their chief symptoms being a muddled brain; and as my pen is not one of the true literary order which will run along without the help of brains, I don't get through as much work as I should like. By the way, when the Spinoza comes out, be so good as not to mention my name in connection with it. I particularly wish not to be known as the translator of the "Ethics," for reasons which it would be "too tedious to mention." You don't know what a severely practical person I am become, and what a sharp eye I have to the main chance. I keep the purse and dole out sovereigns with all the pangs of a miser. In fact, if you were to feel my bump of acquisitiveness, I daresay you would find it in a state of inflammation, like the "veneration" of that clergyman to whom Mr. Donovan said, "Sir, you have recently been engaged in prayer."

September, 1856, made a new era in George Eliot's life, for it was then that she began to write fiction. Hitherto she had been known only as a translator and an essayist, and her style in this latter capacity, although bits of extreme brilliancy alternated with rather heavy writing, was not at all indicative of those qualities which go to make up a good novelist. A short specimen of her heavy commendatory writing (for she flashed only in sarcasm) is the following, extracted from an analysis of Hennell's "Inquiry," published in 1852 :—

The author opens his inquiry with a historical sketch, extending from the Babylonish Captivity to the end of the first century, the design of which is to show how, abstracting the idea of the miraculous, or any speciality of divine influence, the gradual development of certain elements in Jewish character, and the train of events in Jewish history, contributed to form a suitable nidus for the production of a

character and career like that of Jesus, and how the devoted enthusiasm generated by such a career in his immediate disciples rendering it easier for them to modify their ideas of the Messiah than to renounce their belief in their Master's Messiahship,—the accession of Gentile converts and the destruction of the last remnants of theocracy necessitating a wider interpretation of Messianic hopes,—the junction of Christian ideas with Alexandrian Platonism, and the decrepitude of Polytheism, combined to associate the name of Jesus, his Messiahship, his death and his resurrection, with a great moral and religious revolution.

A great deal has been said about the long-windedness of German writers, but we do not remember in German literature anything much worse than this.

At any rate, Mr. Lewes, who was a keen-eyed detective in such matters, and who had had ample opportunities for estimating George Eliot's abilities, had no idea as yet of the rare powers that were concealed in her. He did not doubt her talent for writing a newspaper article, or a review; nay, we are told that her article on "Cumming" in the *WESTMINSTER*, convinced him that she had true genius, but he doubted her possession of the highest quality required for fiction—the power of dramatic presentation, or, as he called it, dramatic ventriloquism. Still, he wanted her to make the experiment, and now that she had achieved in other kinds of writing greater success than he had ever anticipated for her, he urged her to begin at once. He would say: "It may be a failure, it may be that you are unable to write fiction. Or perhaps it may be just good enough to warrant your trying again. Or you may write a *chef-d'œuvre* at once—there's no telling."

George Eliot, on her side, had always had a vague dream that some day she might write a novel, and she had even composed an introductory chapter describing the farmhouses and the life of a Staffordshire village; but although she felt herself competent to do the descriptive parts, she lacked confidence with respect to the rest, and the attempt was dropped in one of her fits of despondency. She says in one of her letters: "I never think what I write is good for anything till other people tell me so, and even then it always seems to me as if I should never write anything *else* worth reading." However, under the encouragement supplied by Mr. Lewes, her mind now reverted to the idea of composition, and one morning, as she was thinking what should be the subject of her first story, her thoughts merged into a dreamy doze, and she imagined herself writing a tale under the title, "The Sad Fortunes of the Reverend Amos Barton." Awaking, she at once told her husband, who pronounced the title capital. The story, however, was not begun

for several weeks more, and although Mr. Lewes highly commended the work as it progressed (declaring to his wife that her power of writing dialogue was now proved beyond dispute), the question whether she could command pathos remained an open one until settled by the account of poor Milly's death. This was written one evening that Lewes had gone up to town (from Richmond) on purpose that his wife might be more undisturbed; but when he came back and the chapter was read to him, both of them cried over it, and Lewes came up and kissed his wife, saying: "I think your pathos is better than your fun."

It had already been decided that the story should be one of a series, bearing the title "Scenes of Clerical Life." "Amos Barton" was written between Sept. 22 and Nov. 5, 1856, and just as soon as it was finished, Mr. Lewes sent it to Blackwood with a view to its insertion in "Maga." The manuscript, he wrote, had been submitted to him by a friend, who desired his good offices.

I confess [he says] that before reading the MS. I had considerable doubts of my friend's powers as a writer of fiction; but after reading it, my doubts have been changed into very high admiration. I don't know what you will think of the story, but according to my judgment, such humour, pathos, vivid presentation and nice observation, have not been exhibited (in this style) since "The Vicar of Wakefield;" and in consequence of this opinion, I feel quite pleased in negotiating the matter with you.

Mr. John Blackwood at once approved the story, thereby showing his own excellent discernment, but some faint reticences in his approbation were quite enough to dash buckets of cold water over the too sensitive anonymous author. Mr. Blackwood's praise, however, grew warmer after a few days, and he and George Eliot were soon on the most cordial terms, although the thick veil drawn over her personality was not lifted till long afterwards—February, 1858. The pseudonym "George Eliot" was selected, as we are told, because the first name was that of Mr. Lewes, and because "Eliot" seemed a "good mouth-filling, easily pronounced word."

It is not our purpose to follow Mr. Cross through the history of George Eliot's productions, still less to analyze or attempt to estimate them. Our concern is with the woman, not the authoress. "Amos Barton" was published in January, 1857, and the next four years witnessed the production of "Mr. Gilfil's Love-story," "Janet's Repentance," "Adam Bede," "The Mill on the Floss," and "Silas Marner." During all this time George Eliot wrote from the fulness of the treasure she had accumulated unnoticed, perhaps unconsciously, in her earliest years, and which had been lying latent ever since, deeply covered over

by more recent acquisitions, awaiting the hour which was to bring it suddenly to light. She wrote easily, currently; sometimes feeling as if she were under the dictation of an other self; rejoicing in her enlarged existence, in the admiring sympathies which poured in upon her from all sides, in the consciousness of that expanded action upon humanity which had been the haunting day-dream of her youth. She had crept forth doubtfully with her little manuscript in her hand, and lo, without prestige, without a coterie, without the attractions of adventure, or of a plot, or of aristocratic separate scenes, she had taken the literary world by storm. Criticism hardly dared to throw in a discordant note. She was exactly in the position which suited her best, acclaimed and yet unknown: sheltered from personal inquisitiveness by the privacy of a home which was full for her of tenderest solicitude and most appreciative attention, yet standing out on high in her disguise, and swaying the multitude at her feet to laughter and to tears. The following are some short extracts from her letters:

*June 6, 1857.*—I am very happy—happy in the highest blessing life can give us—the perfect love and sympathy of a nature that stimulates my own to healthful activity. I feel too that all the terrible pain I have gone through in past years, partly from the defects of my own nature, partly from outward things, has probably been a preparation for some special work that I may do before I die. That is a blessed hope, to be rejoiced in with trembling. But even if that hope should be unfulfilled, I am contented to have lived and suffered for the sake of what has already been.

*Nov. 1, 1857.*—I can't help wondering [she writes to Mrs. Bray] that you can think of me in the past with much pleasure. It all seems so painful to me—made up of blunders and selfishness—and it only comes back upon me like a thing to be forgiven. That is honest painful truth, and not sentimentality. But I am thankful if others found more good than I am able to remember.

*Dec. 31, 1857.*—My life has deepened unspeakably during the last year: I feel a greater capacity for moral and intellectual enjoyment; a more acute sense of my deficiencies in the past; a more solemn desire to be faithful to coming duties than I remember at any former period of my life. And my happiness has deepened too: the blessedness of a perfect love and union grows daily. . . . Few women, I fear, have had such reason as I have to think the long sad years of youth were worth living for the sake of middle age.

The reader will have noticed how George Eliot, in her happiness, speaks of the increased sense of her deficiencies. The same remark runs through all these volumes, and it certainly refers to one of the most characteristic points in this characteristic nature. We have all of us heard a great deal about the purifying medication of adversity, and the sweet uses of the rod. Is it not time for somebody to descant upon the

tonifying virtues of prosperity and the chastening discipline of praise? No better text for such a sermon than George Eliot. She writes from Switzerland, during her sojourn with the d'Alberts:—

I want encouraging rather than warning and checking. I believe I am so constituted that I shall never be cured of my faults, except by God's discipline. If human beings would but believe it, they do me most good by saying to me the kindest things truth will permit, and really I cannot hope that these will be superlatively kind.

This truth is exemplified in a dozen instances, of which we need only quote one. In 1879, George Eliot received a presentation copy of a little volume, entitled "The Ethics of George Eliot's Works." The title alone suffices to characterize the book as one of unmitigated admiration, and it was the second of this kind which had already appeared, the first having been named "Wise, Witty, and Tender Sayings, in Prose and in Verse." We are not aware of any other novelist who ever received in his lifetime such superlative marks of recognition. Well, George Eliot had only "cut a very little way into the volume when a friend came and carried it off." But her glance had fallen for a moment on certain remarks respecting the character of Harold Transome, and she had been highly pleased with their penetrating appreciativeness. This was enough. "When my friend," she writes, "brings back the volume, *I shall read it reverentially, and most probably with a sense of being usefully admonished.* For praise and sympathy arouse much more self-suspicion and sense of shortcoming than all the blame and depreciation of all the Pepins."

Not only did laudation act as a corrective on George Eliot, but it was the only corrective applicable. Exalted to the skies, she would castigate herself unmercifully; whisper but one word of criticism, and all her sympathies would instantly contract. So well did Mr. Lewes understand this disposition, that not only did he always approve enthusiastically what his wife read to him, but that he even applied himself as much as possible to the exclusion of all criticism from without, by reading through the newspapers and reviews before allowing them to pass into her hands, and by *cutting out* whatever appreciations of her works were likely to give her a "spiritual chill." The rationale of this is, as we take it, that George Eliot, in phrenological parlance, had enormous love of approbation and very large ideality. As long as she felt herself thoroughly approved, the happiness resulting therefrom fired her with an ardour to be better, more deserving still, and, measuring the reality alongside of her ideal, she felt such a shortcoming as no one else would feel. But just as soon as her need of approbation met with a repulse, the disturbance

thus caused was sufficient to throw her whole being, physical and mental, out of gear. The normal functions were suspended; the reverential attitude was lost in pain; the voice "Excelsior" was stifled in the hubbub of conflicting emotions; and of the wonderful creature who, but a moment ago, was ready to embrace all humanity in her sympathies, and raise her moral aspirations to the very stars, there remained nothing but a shivering, disappointed woman, irritated by injustice and prostrate with a headache. "Compare with this the tendency of Thackeray to depreciate his own novels, and the ease with which he would proclaim that the public was already tired of them!"

It was especially after writing "Adam Bede" that the importance of her mission was brought home to her. Of her "Scenes of Clerical Life" she was content to think as of "a bit of faithful work, that will, perhaps, remain like a primrose root in the hedgerow, and gladden and chasten human hearts in years to come." But her expectations rose with the delineation of Dinah. We find her writing, in May, 1859, to Major Blackwood:—

Yes, I *am* assured now that "Adam Bede" was worth writing—worth living through long years to write. But now it seems impossible to me that I shall ever write anything so good and true again. I have arrived at faith in the past, but not at faith in the future.

After enjoying intensely the triumph of her authorship behind the veil, George Eliot was now to enjoy the pleasure of being saluted in her real personality. She seems to have felt disappointed that her old friends in Coventry had not yet recognized her writing; still more disappointed that they had been inclined to admit the pretensions of that miserable impostor Liggins. Yet when Mr. Bray had written to her a few months before, alluding to a rumour that she was writing a novel, she rebuffed him almost harshly, and bade him beware lest he should injure her interests. But now (in May, 1859), when she received from her friend, Mme. Bodichon, the first recognition of her authorship, on internal grounds alone, her joy was characteristic:—

God bless you, dearest Barbara, for your love and sympathy. You are the first friend who has given any symptom of knowing me—the first heart that has recognized me in a book which has come from my heart of hearts. But keep the secret solemnly till I give you leave to tell it, and give way to no impulses of triumphant affection. You have sense enough to know how important the *incognito* has been, and we are anxious to keep it up for a few months longer. Curiously enough, my old Coventry friends, who have certainly read the *WESTMINSTER* and the *Times*, and have probably by this time read the book itself, have given no sign of recognition. But a certain

Mr. Liggins, whom rumour has fixed on as the author of my books, and whom they have believed in, has probably screened me from their vision. I am a very blessed woman, am I not, to have all this reason for being glad that I have lived? I have had no time of exultation—on the contrary, these last months have been sadder than usual to me; and I have thought more of the future and the much work that remains to be done in life than of anything that has been achieved. But I think your letter to-day gave me more joy—more heart-glow—than all the letters or reviews or other testimonies of success that have come to me since the evenings when I read aloud my manuscript to my dear, dear husband, and he laughed and cried alternately, and then rushed to me to kiss me. He is the prime blessing that has made all the rest possible to me, giving me a response to everything I have written—a response that I could confide in, as a proof that I had not mistaken my work.

What a charming picture of home-life, and how impossible it is not to love Lewes for the absolute simplicity and truthfulness of abnegation which crops out through all this correspondence! Remember, he too was writing for the public all this time, and he had even tried his hand at novels. Yet no momentary pre-occupation of self seems ever to mar his perfect surrender to his wife, his readiness to minister to her unceasing demands upon his attention and his sympathy. Had there ever been the faintest reticence, the slightest ring of impure metal on his part, would not her ear have instantly detected it? But no, there was none; and this negative tribute is the highest which these volumes can render to his memory. Doubtless, he was not perfect, but whatever his deficiencies may have been (and the present writer knows nothing of them), they cannot but have been outweighed a hundredfold by the rare qualities to which his wife bears testimony. His health was very far from good, and he often suffered acutely, but “Mr. Lewes is better-tempered and more cheerful *with* headache than most people without it.” He was a brilliant talker, and eminently fitted to have the best in conversation, yet he never talked for mastery. His wife writes:—“In this respect I know *no* man so great as he, that difference of opinion rouses no egoistic irritation in him, and that he is ready to admit that another argument is stronger the moment his intellect recognizes it.” “He is one of the few human beings I have known who will often, in the heat of an argument, see and straightway confess that he is in the wrong, instead of trying to shift his ground or use any other device of vanity.” Respecting his authorship she says:—“George’s happiness in writing his books makes him less dependent than most authors upon the audience he finds.” “No man is more indifferent than he to what is said about himself.” His sensitiveness was only for his wife; his sole anxiety was lest her

feelings should be hurt. It may, indeed, be asked what her life would have been without his fostering care; without the buoyancy and hopefulness which cheered her depressed spirits; without the chivalrous readiness with which he relieved her of all drudgery, and the cordial sympathy with which he stimulated her productiveness! Truly, he is entitled to a share of our gratitude to her.

We remarked above that the first period of George Eliot's novels—beginning with "*Scenes of Clerical Life*" and ending with "*Silas Marner*"—was produced exclusively out of the materials accumulated in her early youth. We find her writing in 1859:

I do wish much to see more of human life—how can one see enough in the short years one has to stay in the world? But I meant that at present my mind works with the most freedom and the keenest sense of poetry in my remotest past, and there are many strata to be worked through before I can begin to use, artistically, any material I may gather in the present.

This period was brought to a close at the beginning of 1861—George Eliot being then in her forty-second year—and, to our thinking, she never wrote again with such perfect assimilation of her elements. Hers was a soil in which the seed had to undergo a long process of maturing underground before it could shoot upwards with robust vitality. Be this as it may, it is certain that the writing of "*Romola*"—which was George Eliot's next great work, and which lasted from October 1861 to June 1863—proved a far greater strain upon her than any previous tale. From this time onwards she betrays symptoms of fatigue. "I began it," she says, "as a young woman; I finished it as an old woman." In the estimation of the present writer, "*Romola*" is a failure as far as true *Italian* colouring is concerned, and greatly inferior, in this respect, to George Sand's "*Daniella*;" but it is usual for authors to prize most what has cost them the greatest effort, and, accordingly, George Eliot rates "*Romola*" extremely high. She writes, some fifteen years later, in January, 1877, with respect to a new edition:

There is no book of mine about which I more thoroughly feel that I could swear by every sentence as having been written with my best blood, such as it is, and with the most ardent care for veracity of which my nature is capable.\* It has made me often sob with a sort

\* Alas! care in such matters is generally an indication of failure. Presentations of the highest order are written spontaneously, under a kind of compulsion; the author ought not to feel it possible that they should be written otherwise than they are.



of painful joy as I have read the sentences which had faded from my memory.

And, about the same time :

I have had a request from Signor Bartolommeo Aquarone, of Sienna, for leave to translate "Romola," and declaring that, as one who has given special study to the history of San Marco, and has written a life of Fra Girolamo Savonarola, he cares that "Romola" should be known to his countrymen, for their good. *Magnificat anima mea !*

Would one not think, from such writing as this, that "Romola" were a kind of gospel, and that nations were to be regenerated by it ? Yet such was really George Eliot's attitude of mind—*reverential, not conceited*—and the fact will be easily admitted by those who penetrate this extraordinary nature sufficiently to understand that a sort of religious enthusiasm—chequered, it is true, by fits of despondency—was the normal condition of her mind. She speaks of enthusiasm as of that without which she cannot even pour out breakfast well !

It will be easily understood that in proportion as the loftiness, the almost sanctity, of her function as a writer, took possession of her, she became more and more sensitive and nervous as to any disturbing influences, and more and more distressed as to the difficulty of accomplishing her mission to the utmost. She writes to Mrs. Bray, in July, 1859 :

The weight of my future life—the self-questioning whether my nature will be able to meet the heavy demands upon it . . . "presses upon me continually in a way that prevents me even from tasting the quiet joy I might have in the *work done*. Buoyancy and exultation, I fancy, are out of the question when one has lived so long as I have. . . . I often think of my dreams when I was four or five and twenty. I thought then how happy fame would make me ! I feel no regret that the fame, as such, brings no pleasure ; but it is a grief to me that I do not constantly feel strong in thankfulness that my life has vindicated its uses, and given me reason for gladness that such an unpromising woman-child was born into the world.

And again, shortly after she had revealed the secret of her authorship to her friends at Coventry (June, 1859) :

I feel that the influence of talking about my books, even to you and Mrs. Bodichon, has been so bad to me that I should like to keep silence concerning them for evermore. If people were to buzz round me with their remarks, or compliments, I should lose the repose of mind and truthfulness of production, without which no good books can be written. Talking about my books, I find, has much the same malign effect on me as talking of my feelings or my religion.

"Romola" is succeeded by "Felix Holt" (a novel certainly far below the level hitherto attained) ; and afterwards by "The

Spanish Gipsy" and "Middlemarch." The latter was finished towards the end of 1872. At this time George Eliot, although only fifty-three, had decidedly reached the evening of her life. For the first time in many years, during which she had been constantly shifting her residence, and flitting to and fro between England and the Continent, she expresses a wish to have a permanent home, and stay there till the end. Her thoughts of death are frequent, but they are not in the least gloomy—only tinged with the gentle melancholy of autumn. In July, 1870, we find her writing :

For nearly a year death seems to be my most intimate daily companion. I mingle the thought of it with every other, not sadly, but as one mingles the thought of some one who is nearest in love and duty with all one's motives. I try to delight in the sunshine that will be when I shall never see it any more. And I think it is possible for this sort of impersonal life to attain great intensity,—possible for us to gain much more independence, than is usually believed, of the small bundle of facts that make our own personality. . . . . We women are always in danger of living too exclusively in the affections; and though our affections are perhaps the best gifts we have, we ought also to have our share of the more independent life—some joy in things for their own sake. It is piteous to see the helplessness of some sweet women when their affections are disappointed—because all their teaching has been, that they can only delight in study of any kind for the sake of a personal love. They have never contemplated an independent delight in ideas as an experience which they could confess without being laughed at. Yet surely women need this sort of defence against passionate affection even more than men.

Again, she writes to Mrs. Wm. Smith, July 1, 1874 :—

What you say of the reasons why one may wish even for the anguish of being *left* for the sake of waiting on the beloved one to the end—all that goes to my heart of hearts. It is what I think of almost daily. For death seems to me now a close, real experience, like the approach of autumn or winter; and I am glad to find that advancing life brings this power of imagining the nearness of death I never had till of late years.

As far as we can judge from the correspondence, this portion of George Eliot's life seems to have been the sweetest and most lovable. A kind of lull is descending upon her; the fire of youth is burning lower, but clearer; she has passed through the furnace of prosperity and come forth purified; her faults, through what she called "God's discipline," have been toned down; her noble sympathies remain and diffuse a grave, tender serenity over her whole person. With that marvellous knowledge of self which she displays so often, and which makes the critic almost ashamed of his censures, she says :

*Dec. 1870.*—My strong egoism has caused me so much melancholy which is traceable simply to a fastidious yet hungry ambition, that I am relieved by the comparative quietude of personal cravings which age is bringing.

*April, 1873.*—It is one of the gains of advancing age that the good of young creatures becomes a more definite intense joy to us. With that renunciation for ourselves which age inevitably brings, we get more freedom of soul to enter into the life of others: what we can never learn they will know, and the gladness which is a departed sunlight to us is rising with the strength of morning to them.

*July, 1874.*—I am no longer one of those whom Dante found in hell-border because they had been sad under the blessed sunlight. I am uniformly cheerful now—feeling the preciousness of these moments, in which I still possess love and thought.

*Nov. 1876.*—It is remarkable to me that I have entirely lost my *personal* melancholy. I often, of course, have melancholy thoughts about the destinies of my fellow-creatures, but I am never in that *mood* of sadness which used to be my frequent visitant even in the midst of external happiness. And this, notwithstanding a very vivid sense that life is declining and death close at hand.

The year 1874 brings the publication of "The Legend of Jubal" and the initial preparation of "Daniel Deronda." This latter book, which was published in 1876, brings into still bolder relief George Eliot's preoccupation of being a great æsthetic teacher. She grows also more fastidious in her self-culture, and declines henceforth to read any other novels than her own. As usual, she stores up gravely, carefully, every appreciatory notice that is collected for her, and lifts up her heart in thankfulness over each successive coin that she drops into her savings-box of praise. It is impossible sometimes to repress a smile over such *naïveté*, but it should always be remembered that in George Eliot's case this intense self-consciousness was intimately mingled with the most ideal aspiration and the most ardent desire to justify her life by doing good.

*Journal, Dec. 15, 1876.*—At the beginning of this week I had deep satisfaction from reading in the *Times* the report of a lecture on "Daniel Deronda," delivered by Dr. Hermann Adler to the Jewish working-men, a lecture showing much insight and implying an expectation of serious benefit. Since then I have had a delightful letter from the Jewish Theological Seminary at Breslau, written by an American Jew, named Isaacs, who excuses himself for expressing his feeling of gratitude on reading "Deronda," and assures me of his belief that it has even already had an elevating effect on the minds of some of his people—predicting that the effect will spread.

*Nov. 10, 1877.*—There have been multiplied signs that the spiritual effect of "Deronda" is growing. In America the book is placed above all my previous writings.

The following scraps will show her attitude towards the critics, who at present were not so unanimous in her praise as formerly :—

*Feb.* 1869.—It is one of the afflictions of authorship to know that the brains which should be used in understanding a book are wasted in discussing the hastiest misconceptions about it.

*May*, 1877.—I must tell you that it is my rule, very strictly observed, not to read the criticisms on my writings. (This can only mean *adverse* criticism, for there is abundant evidence that she read the appreciations of admirers.) For years I have found this abstinence necessary to preserve me from that discouragement which ill-judged praise, no less than ill-judged blame, tends to produce in me. . . . Believe me, I should not have cared to devour even ardent praise if it had not come from one who showed the discriminating sensibility, the perfect response to the artist's intention, which must make the fullest, rarest joy to one who works from inward conviction, and not in compliance with current fashions.

*June*, 1873.—I am greatly indebted to you for your letter. It has done something towards rousing me from what I will not call self-despair, but resignation to being of no use.

I wonder whether you at all imagine the terrible pressure of disbelief in my own { duty / right } to speak to the public, which is apt with me to make all beginnings of work like a rowing against tide. Not that I am without my fair ounce of self-conceit and confidence that I know better than the critics, *whom I don't take the trouble to read, but who seem to fill the air as with the smoke of bad tobacco.\**

We may add, for the sake of completing our mere mention of George Eliot's principal works, that her only subsequent composition was "The Impressions of Theophrastus Such." This was written before the death of Mr. Lewes, in November, 1878, but its publication did not take place until several months later. But already before this terrible bereavement, George Eliot had begun to debate whether she would not act most wisely in laying down her pen. She writes in closing her old journal at the end of 1877 :

As the years advance, there is a new rational ground for the expectation that my life may become less fruitful. The difficulty is to decide how far resolution should set in the direction of activity, rather than in the acceptance of a mere negative state.

Before we hasten to the close of George Eliot's life, it may be well to say a few words as to two inquiries for which we have been unable hitherto to find a place. It has always seemed to us that one of the best tests for sympathetic action is to examine how it is manifested towards those who are mourning for the loss

---

\* The italics are our own.

of one beloved. George Eliot was possessed of sympathy to a supreme degree; the main object of her writing was to develop this power in her readers, and all those who have had the privilege of knowing her personally, are unanimous in their testimony that her greatest charm lay in her faculty of entering into the sorrows, the needs, the idiosyncrasies of all those who approached her. It is therefore of great interest to inquire how such a woman spoke to those whom death had deprived of their chief treasures:

*To Mrs. Bray, March, 1865.*—I believe you are one of the few that can understand that in certain crises direct expression of sympathy is the least possible to those who most feel sympathy. If I could have been with you in bodily presence, I should have sat silent, thinking silence a sign of feeling that speech, trying to be wise, must always spoil. The truest things one can say about great Death are the oldest, simplest things that everybody knows by rote, but that no one knows really till death has come very close. And when that inward teaching is going on, it is pitiful presumption for those who are outside to be saying anything. . . . What I want my letter to tell you is that I love you truly, gratefully, unchangeably.

*To Mrs. Wm. Smith, Nov. 1872.*—I know, dear friend, that the sorrow is irremediable; but the pain—the anguish—will become less sharp, and life will be less difficult. You will think of things to do such as he would approve of your doing, and every day will be sacred with his memory, his presence. . . . It is wealth you have—that of several sweet nieces to whom being with you is a happiness. You can feel some sympathy in their cheerfulness, even though sorrow is always your own private good—can you not, dear friend?—and the time is short at the utmost. The blessed reunion, if it may come, must be patiently waited for; and such good as you can do to others, by loving looks and words, must seem to you like a closer companionship with the gentleness and benignity which you justly worshipped while it was visibly present, and still more perhaps now it is veiled, and is a memory stronger than vision of outward things.

Our second inquiry shall be as to George Eliot's religious beliefs. Here, however, the difficulties to contend with are much greater. That George Eliot had a profoundly religious nature (by which we do not mean that the first Evangelical manifestations of it were at all remarkable for originality or depth) cannot be doubted for an instant, but she seems to have been singularly shy of expressing her preference for any particular embodiment of it. She writes to Frederic Harrison, in January, 1870:

Mr. Lewes would tell you that I have an unreasonable aversion to personal statements, and when I come to like them it is usually by a hard process of conversion. . . . The fact is, I shrink from decided "deliverances" on momentous subjects from the dread of

coming to swear by my own "deliverances," and sinking into an insistent echo of myself. That is a horrible destiny—and one cannot help seeing that many of the most powerful men fall into it.

This is a remarkable utterance, and we think that the fact of being able to keep one's mind perfectly open on a question frequently recurred to and meditated upon, is a proof of great intellectual strength. Such withholding of the judgment is generally felt to be a state of unstable equilibrium, from which the mind tends to escape by rolling down the declivity, either on one side or another. Nevertheless, it may be that, in George Eliot's case, the reason of her aversion to any distinct utterances was not so much the difficulty of deciding between conflicting testimonies, as the unwillingness to part with a certain haze of reverential contemplation in which her imagination loved to dwell. Thus, after reading Darwin's "Origin of Species," of which she shows very little warm appreciation, we find her writing: "To me, the development theory, and all other explanations of processes by which things came to be, produce a feeble impression compared with the mystery that lies under the processes." In a word, hers was a poetic, not a scientific mind. She says of Goethe that he had a strain of mysticism in his soul, "of so much mysticism as, I think, belongs to a full poetic nature—I mean the delighted bathing of the soul in emotions which overpass the outlines of definite thought." After this, it is not difficult to perceive that she recognized a strain of mysticism in herself.

The religion of humanity—such is probably the formula which best expresses what she vaguely sought. She believed "that a religion more perfect than any yet prevalent must express less care for personal consolation, and a more deeply awing sense of responsibility to man, springing from sympathy with that which, of all things, is most certainly known to us, the difficulty of the human lot." She believed in "one comprehensive Church, whose fellowship consists in the desire to purify and ennoble human life, and where the best members of all narrower Churches may call themselves brother and sister in spite of differences." She believed that the fellowship between man and man has been the principle of all development, social and moral—a principle which has not been furthered by conceptions of what is not man, but, on the contrary, by the ideal of a goodness entirely human—*i.e.*, an exaltation of the human. This, she declares, is the main bearing of all her books, a conclusion without which she would not have cared to write any representation of human life. And she believes that this sense of human fellowship, at least in its ultimate development, is a *sufficient* basis of all ethical conduct,

sufficient without either the hope of heaven or the fear of hell. She writes to the Hon. Mrs. Ponsonby, December, 1874 :

Have you quite fairly represented yourself in saying that you have ceased to pity your suffering fellow-men, because you can no longer think of them as individualities of immortal duration . . . that you feel less for them now you regard them as more miserable ? And, on a closer examination of your feelings, should you find that you had lost all sense of quality in action—all possibility of admiration that yearns to imitate—all keen sense of what is cruel and injurious—all belief that your conduct (and therefore the conduct of others) can have any difference of effect on the well-being of those immediately about you (and therefore on those afar off), whether you carelessly follow your selfish moods or encourage that vision of others' needs, which is the source of justice, tenderness, sympathy in the fullest sense ? I cannot believe that your strong intellect will continue to see, in the conditions of man's appearance on this planet, a destructive relation to your sympathy : this seems to me equivalent to saying that you care no longer for colour, now you know the laws of the spectrum.

Looking upon religious symbols, such as they have existed hitherto, not as "*false* ideas, but *temporary* ones—caterpillars and chrysalids of future ideas"—George Eliot declares her participation in all forms of worship, especially in those which are clad for her in the beauty of old associations. This is probably the reason why she has so little sympathy with Freethinkers as a class. "What pitiable people," she exclaims, "are those who feel no poetry in Christianity !" Mere antagonism to religious doctrines has lost all interest for her ; she cares only to know "the lasting meaning that lies in all religious doctrine from the beginning till now." She writes to Mr. Cross in October, 1873 :

All the great religions of the world, historically considered, are rightly the objects of deep reverence and sympathy—they are the record of spiritual struggles, which are the types of our own. This is to me pre-eminently true of Hebrewism and Christianity, on which my own youth was nourished. And in this sense I have no antagonism towards any religious belief, but a strong outflow of sympathy. Every community met to worship the highest Good (which is understood to be expressed by God) carries me along in its main current ; and if there were not reasons against my following such an inclination, I should go to church or chapel, constantly, for the sake of the delightful emotions of fellowship which come over me in religious assemblies—the very nature of such assemblies being the recognition of a binding belief or spiritual law, which is to lift us into willing obedience, and save us from the slavery of unregulated passion or impulse.

We must here close our extracts from this most interesting

part of George Eliot's letters, and proceed to give a brief outline of the last events of her life. The death of the dear companion who, for more than twenty-four years, had been "a perpetual fountain of courage and cheerfulness" at her side, cast her for several months into profound prostration. The loss occurred on November 28, 1878, and the following February she had not yet been outside her gates. "Even if I were otherwise able," she writes, "I could not bear to go out of sight of the things he used and looked upon." But so powerful an organization could not but rally, even after so terrible a blow. There was work to be done—a Physiological Studentship to be founded in her husband's memory; proofs to be revised, both of his work and her own; trustees, editors, publishers to be consulted, and this compulsory activity gradually restored her to life's current. At bottom, the world was still *intensely interesting* to her. Mr. J. W. Cross, with whom and with whose mother and sisters George Eliot had become intimate many years before, was now living at Weybridge, within an easy distance of Mrs. Lewes's residence at Witley, and his visits to her soon became very frequent. On the 30th of March, George Eliot makes this entry in her journal:—"Mr. Bowen came, Mr. Spencer, and J." The simple initial is significant. Mr. Cross was at this time beginning to read Dante, with but slight knowledge of Italian. As soon as he informed George Eliot what he was doing, she exclaimed: "Oh, I must read that with you." Accordingly, in the next twelve months they read the "Inferno" together, as well as much other matter. The intimacy progressed so well that, on the 9th of April, 1880, it was decided that it should be sealed, as soon as practicable, by marriage. On the 6th of May following, the ceremony was performed in St. George's Church, Hanover Square, and Mr. and Mrs. Cross started for Italy on their wedding tour.

This event, which up to the last moment had been kept secret, even from George Eliot's nearest friends, caused, as everybody remembers, much surprise and some pain. We think, for our part, that for those who knew George Eliot personally, no other issue was to be expected: From her infancy upwards, when she would not be separated from her brother Isaac, the prime craving of her nature was to have some one companion who should be all in all to her, and to whom she should be all in all. For the last quarter of a century she had had such a companion in Mr. Lewes, and her dependence on him had from the first been absolute. It extended even to that literary province in which the supremacy was so manifestly hers; and it is wonderful to see how this great genius waited on the approval of her confidential listener, and would not trust her own productions until she had tested them by his emotion. Partly from the



irregularity of her social position, partly through her devotion to her work, partly through the exigencies of her health, which necessitated frequent absences from England, her life had passed away in a solitude *à deux*. Was it possible that she should now continue it on a totally different basis ; that she, who for twenty-four years had lived in an artificial atmosphere, should suddenly throw open her windows to the sharp air, and pass from the condition of a greenhouse plant to that of a weather-beaten Alpine stump ? Such a question is no sooner asked than answered. Being given the offer of a devotion which was to fill the terrifying void before her, and afford at least a possibility of further happiness and usefulness, she could not do otherwise than accept it. George Eliot was not yet tired of life—such natures never are—and the choice for her was between marriage and the grave.

For a brief while it seemed as though a new lease of existence had been granted. Mr. Cross, who formerly had hardly ever seen his wife otherwise than ailing, was astonished to find what an amount of activity she still could bear. While at Paris they “spent their mornings at the Louvre or the Luxembourg, looking at pictures or sculpture, or seeing other sights—always fatiguing work.” In the afternoon they “took long walks in the Bois, and often went to the theatre in the evening. Reading and writing filled in all the interstices of time ; yet there was no consciousness of fatigue.” The amount of reading they went through together was astonishing for so short a space of time. Thus Mr. Cross mentions that at Witley they generally began with “some chapters of the Bible” (“a very precious and sacred book to her, not only from early associations, but also from the profound conviction of its importance in the development of the religious life of man”), and then passed on to Goethe’s “Faust,” “Hermann und Dorothea,” Shakespeare, Milton, Wordsworth, Tennyson, some of Scott’s novels and Lamb’s essays ; and, finally, for graver reading, such books as Professor Sayce’s “Introduction to the Science of Language,” Max Müller’s “Lectures on the Science of Language,” &c. Truly, companionship such as this cannot have been a sinecure, and the endeavour to keep pace may sometimes have produced a sense of effort. Continuous thought did not fatigue George Eliot. She could keep her mind on the stretch for hours, and pass from one study to another. The map of the heavens lay constantly on her table, and she was longing for a better knowledge of astronomy. On the eve of the day on which her last illness began, she went with her husband to see “The Agamemnon,” performed in Greek by Oxford undergraduates. But the body was at this time already much older than the mind, and the pericardium being affected, an apparently

trifling disorder of the throat soon developed into a mortal disease. On December 22, 1880—about nineteen months and a half after her marriage with Mr. Cross—George Eliot passed away.

The head of a man of genius on the shoulders of a highly sensitive and nervous woman—such is the shortest description we can suggest of George Eliot. In this duality, this striking combination of masculine and feminine elements, lay the secret of her genius and of her foibles. The universality of her culture; the command of subjects which so rarely come within a woman's ken; her power of protracted application; the firmness (perhaps the heaviness) of her intellectual tread; and, above all, the originality, the fearlessness, the independence of her mind—all this was eminently virile. On the other hand, the delicate frailty of her nervous organization; her physical timidity; her susceptibility to terror (as depicted in *Gwendolen Harleth*); the acuteness and quickness of her observation; her tendency to exaltation; her clinging nature and need of support; the closeness and absorbing character of her attachments; her readiness of sympathy and pity; her exaggerated sensibility to blame—these qualities, surely, are supremely feminine. Thin-skinned and strong-headed; centred in herself, yet responsive to every vibration of the world around; quick in collecting her materials, yet slow and thorough in elaborating them; comprehensive of all natures, because she was herself a compound of them all—George Eliot was thus in the best possible position to do the work which has cast such lustre on her name. Her weakness conspired with her strength; if her life had been more of a heroic tissue, her creative range would probably have been more limited. Such men as Walter Scott, as Thackeray, lived with far more dignity than George Eliot, but their works have not the variety of hers. This point of view seems to us one of paramount importance. Of course, in such a nature as George Eliot's, contradictions—or rather, apparent contradictions—must abound. Thus, it seems extraordinary that a woman so morbidly sensitive to criticism should have acted, in the most important occasions of her life, in direct defiance of opinion. By her sudden rupture with the religion of her youth, she separated herself, not only from her relatives, but from the whole Christian community to which she had hitherto belonged; by her union with Mr. Lewes, she threw down the gauntlet to society; by her marriage with Mr. Cross, she surprised and grieved her friends. The solution of the problem is, we think, that with all George Eliot's sociability, her need was chiefly for the society of *one*, and that as long as she could lean upon a single staunch

ally, she found no difficulty in doing things at which even the constitutionally bold might hesitate. Singular also is her self-distrust, as coupled with her great originality; singular her power of reticence—nay, secretiveness—as coupled with her vivid sympathy; singular her seclusiveness—her shrinking from any intercourse outside her hermitage—as coupled with her insatiable ambition to extend her spiritual personality, and be a potent factor in the world's development. A further curious detail, as noted by Mr. Cross, is that George Eliot, with all her life-long tendency to melancholy, seems to have remained unconscious of the reflection of this tendency in her writings. For when, at the time of his first acquaintance with her, Mr. Cross was compelled, in reply to a direct question, to admit that, with all his admiration for her books, he found them on the whole profoundly sad, George Eliot was deeply pained by the confession. Much more of this kind might be said, had we not already drawn so largely upon the reader's patience.

We should ill acknowledge our obligations to Mr. Cross, were we not to add that—being given the general plan of his work and the restrictions under which he was placed—he has performed his task with skill and tact and modesty. His own remarks are always excellent, and every reader will regret that he has been so chary of them. But, of necessity, he has given us not so much a "Life" as the "Materials for a Life," and the materials are incomplete, with respect especially to the unmarried portion of George Eliot's career. We hope that the generation which had the privilege of knowing her before she became Mrs. Lewes will not pass away without putting on record the precious memories of which they are depositaries. A full-length portrait of George Eliot has yet to be painted, and every lover of English literature will wish that it be painted soon.

---

# ART. IX.—CHURCH MISSIONS TO MOHAMMEDANS IN THE TURKISH EMPIRE.

1. *Parliamentary Papers for 1844, 1851, 1854, 1855, 1861, 1865, 1867, 1875, and 1879.*
2. *The Mohammedan Missionary Problem.* By H. H. JESSUP. Philadelphia. 1879.
3. *The Church Missionary Intelligencer, from 1851 to 1884.* London.
4. *Reports of the Church Missionary Society, from 1851 to 1885.* London.

THE expediency of carrying on missions to the subjects of a friendly Power will be regarded as doubtful or otherwise according to the standpoint from which the question is viewed. That efforts in the East to convert the Mohammedans to Christianity have hitherto proved unsuccessful has not been denied by any. Various causes have been assigned for the failure, but the tendency of those whose capacity is impugned, is to lay the blame anywhere rather than on themselves. As these missions affect the credit of the Church in her missionary character, an inquiry into the progress of religious liberty in the Turkish dominions, and the use which has been made of the opportunities thus afforded, with a summary of the results which have ensued, may serve to throw light upon the actual situation, and upon the prospects for the future, if the present policy and system of management are to be allowed to continue.

The history of the last forty years is a record of the difficulties which have arisen in holding the Turks to their professions of toleration for the adherents of other religions, of the immunities and freedom of action within certain limits, which have been secured for missionaries by successive ambassadors at the Porte, from the time of Sir Stafford Canning to the last conflict between Sir Henry Layard and the Turks in 1879, and of the fruitless efforts to produce any impression on the Mohammedans. The difficulty of converting a Moslem to Christianity is commonly supposed to be greater than that of converting any other unbeliever, but for what reason has never been satisfactorily explained, while it is an admitted fact that of the few who were supposed to be genuine converts in Constantinople, nearly all, as will hereafter appear, relapsed. The efforts of the agents of the Church Missionary Society have practically up to this time been attended with no results whatever in the Asiatic

regions of the Turkish empire, nor does it appear from their own published statements that direct efforts for the conversion of the Mohammedans form at present any part of their policy.

In the summer of 1843 all Europe was shocked by a report that an Armenian youth had been publicly beheaded in the streets of Constantinople as a renegade from Mohammedanism. About a year and a half before, in a fit of drunkenness, he had become involved in a quarrel with some neighbours, and the court before which he was brought had sentenced him to receive five hundred bastinadoes. Terrified by the penalty, and before he had recovered from his intoxication, he was persuaded to become a Mussulman in order to escape the punishment. Before he had time to reflect upon the consequences, he was taken before the proper functionary to make his recantation, and received from him the name Mehemet instead of his Armenian name Ibrahim. Soon after, repenting of what he had done, he fled to Syra, where he remained for a year and a half, at the end of which time he thought that it would be possible for him to return to Constantinople without much danger. Being recognized by an official who had previously known him, he was denounced at the War Office as a renegade from Islamism, and was forthwith arrested. In order to compel him to give up Christianity a second time, he was subjected to the most cruel usage, and was even exhibited in the streets with his hands tied behind his back as if he were being conducted to execution. Not intimidated by the prospect of death, he continued to proclaim his belief in the Christian religion, and remained firm to the last. When he was led forth to suffer he was followed by the execrations of the Turkish mob, which spat upon him as he passed, and openly reviled the faith for professing which he had been condemned to death. Moved by the tears and entreaties of his distracted family, Sir Stratford Canning exhausted his influence in unavailing endeavours to save his life and turn the Porte from its purpose, every member of it to whom he applied giving him the same answer, expressing a willingness to meet his wishes, but regretting the inexorable necessity of the law. Reporting the case in indignant terms to Lord Aberdeen, who was then Foreign Secretary, he said that he did not believe that any such necessity existed, and that the cruel act of the Government was part and parcel of a system of reaction from the liberal principles beginning to prevail, which was daily gaining strength to the despair of every enlightened Turkish statesman, to the prejudice of the friendly relations then existing between England and Turkey, and the visible decline of the improvements which could alone avert the dissolution of the Turkish empire.

The same views were taken by the Austrian, French, Russian, and Prussian ambassadors at the Porte.

There occurred also about the same time the case of a Maltese who had turned Mohammedan, and who, repenting of his folly a few days after, had returned to Christianity. The Porte becoming aware of his recantation, in order to avoid a difficulty with the ambassador, pretended that a change of creed also involved a change of allegiance, as if by becoming a Mohammedan the Maltese ceased to be a British and became a Turkish subject. His arrest was only prevented by causing him to be conveyed privately out of the country, and what otherwise might have led to a serious collision between Sir Stratford Canning and the Porte was thereby avoided.

Sending instruction to the ambassador as to how he was to act in similar cases, Lord Aberdeen declared that he conceived that every Christian Government was imperatively called upon to raise their voices against such proceedings, whether the laws were executed to the prejudice of their own subjects or of the Christian community in general. He hoped that no repetition of such unjustifiable conduct would be suffered, and still less authorized, by the Porte, and directed him to advise the Turkish Government to take immediate measures for effectually preventing the future commission of such atrocities. Having secured the co-operation of the other European ambassadors, Sir Stratford Canning lost no time in conveying to the Sultan and the Grand Vizier the views of her Majesty's Government. A diplomatic correspondence then ensued, during the progress of which another execution of a young Greek, who in a fit of ill-temper had become a Mussulman and afterwards returned to Christianity, took place at Biljik, near Broussa, by order of the Porte, and in opposition to remonstrance from the municipality of the place where he lived. The victim was only twenty-two years of age, and the horror caused by this act of Mussulman ferocity only rendered the English ambassador more resolute in his determination to put an end at all hazards to such senseless intolerance. Writing to Rifaat Pasha, the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs, he said that he deemed it his duty to invite the Porte to explain its conduct, to express its regret for the two executions in suitable terms, and to give an assurance, admitting of no question for the future, that immediate measures would be taken to prevent the recurrence of such unwise and odious acts. A further correspondence took place, in which the Turks pleaded that the laws of the Koran, being divine, could not be altered or set aside, but they promised that efficacious measures would be taken that Christians who had become Mussulmans and afterwards returned to Christianity should not for the future be put to

death. This undertaking the ambassador declined to accept, because it did not cover the case of hereditary Mohammedans who might hereafter become Christians. He was strengthened in his position, because, having caused the Koran to be examined by competent persons, he was informed that there was no real foundation in it for the punishment with death of an apostate from Islamism, and that the only persons indicated in it as deserving of this penalty were "renegades who were in arms and actually opposed to the Prophet." He was also informed that this view of the law was taken in opposition to the Government by many of the upper classes, and even by a few of the Ulemas, who were for the most part fanatical Moslems. As the Porte still hesitated, he demanded an interview with the Sultan himself, who assured him that from henceforth Christianity should not be insulted in his dominions, and that Christians should not be in any way persecuted for their religion. The scruples of the Turkish Ministers having been overborne, an official declaration was issued, that the Porte "engaged to take effectual measures to prevent for the future the execution of the Christian who was an apostate."

Sir Stratford Canning seeing that this was ambiguous, and knowing the duplicity of the Turks, in his official acknowledgment of the declaration understood it as including "any Christian an apostate from Islamism," and as meaning that no one in the Turkish empire who might hereafter profess Christianity was to be treated as a criminal or persecuted on that account. In one of his letters to Lord Aberdeen he mentioned that Rifaat Pasha when consulting the Grand Mufti (the Sheik ul Islam) was advised by his Holiness not to bring the question under his official notice, because he had no alternative but to declare the law as he found it, adding by way of reservation, that when a State necessity arose the Porte would be found to be the most competent judge, thereby leaving to it a discretionary power. Although the law of the Koran as interpreted by the Turks remained unaltered, he regarded as another important result of the correspondence the understanding that occasions for putting it in force in respect to religious opinions involving capital punishment should for the future be avoided. In another letter he said that there was a further advantage in the precedent which established the right of the ambassador to interfere in similar cases. This was the first passage of arms with the Turks in behalf of religious liberty and toleration, and the gain was great, because although there have since been persecutions of individuals, no Mohammedan has been avowedly put to death for embracing Christianity. Much, however, remained to be wrung from their unwilling hands.

As the Turkish law then stood, persons who receded from the native Christian Churches, for whatever reason, thereby became virtually outlaws, because they were no longer under the protection of the ecclesiastical head of the religious community from which they had withdrawn, and because they had no recognized representative at the Porte. The grievance had become so serious, that the Armenians requested Sir Stratford Canning to interfere with the Government on their behalf. His efforts proved so successful that in November, 1850, a firman was issued by the Sultan Abdul Medjid constituting the Protestants a separate ecclesiastical body, and authorizing them to elect from among themselves an agent or Vakeel to represent them at the Porte, and be the medium of communication with the Prefect of Police. His duty was to be to register all the males in a book to be preserved at the Prefecture, and to keep a list of births, deaths, and marriages. All petitions to the Porte were to be presented, and all the affairs of the community were to be officially transacted, by him and under his seal. The firman also granted to the Protestants full religious liberty and guaranteed protection from persecution.

As in other similar cases, in the course of the efforts to secure complete religious freedom in the Turkish dominions, owing to official apathy or social impediments, the new law did not take effect so freely as was expected. It therefore became necessary to supplement it with another firman invested with an imperial Hatti Sheriff, which gave to it full sanction and authority. On the 1st of June, 1853, a second was issued, granting to all Christians and Jews the right of religious worship on the same footing as the Mohammedans, and confirming all the privileges granted three years before. It was addressed, not to a Turkish official, but to the Vakeel, and to the Greek, Latin, and Armenian Patriarchs. A list of twenty-two provinces in which there were Protestants having been furnished to the Porte, the firman was officially communicated to the governors of each of them, and to the ambassadors of Austria, Great Britain, France, and Prussia. Full religious rights having thus been obtained, the field seemed to be clear for missionary operations, the single restriction being the necessity for registering, with the proper officer, the names of all male converts, including both adults and children. In every case where such persons have not been registered, they are unprotected by any official authority recognized by Turkish law. The list at the Prefecture of Police in Constantinople is therefore the true test of the success of the foreign missionaries. The Armenians were profuse in their expressions of gratitude to the British ambassador for obtaining for the Protestants privileges of such vast importance.



In the spring of 1855, during the Crimean war, a requisition was made to the Turkish Government by Lord Clarendon demanding that certain reforms in favour of Christians should be embodied in Mussulman law. Amongst these was complete toleration for all forms of religion, and absolute exemption of converts from Islamism, whether natives or foreigners, from all punishment. Soon after the instructions embodying them had been forwarded to Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, a memorial was presented to the Foreign Secretary by the Turkish Missions Aid Society, complaining that the pledges given by the Porte in 1844 had not been kept, because there was reason to believe that in 1852 there had been an execution at Aleppo for apostasy, and another, at the end of the following year, at Adrianople. Upon inquiry it was found that these executions had actually taken place. Neither of them had been brought to the notice of the English ambassador, who now lost no time in ascertaining how it was that the Sultan and the Porte had failed to keep the engagement so solemnly entered into with him in 1844. He was informed that both persons had been put to death for blasphemy, as the Turks affirmed, and not for apostasy from Islamism. This distinction he regarded as a mere pretext, invented to mask the application to these unhappy men of the old unrepealed law, which could be more easily contrived than exposed. In a letter to Lord Clarendon recapitulating what had occurred eleven years before, he mentioned that then he had great difficulty in inducing the Ottoman Secretary of State to accept from him the document containing his acknowledgment of the declaration of the Porte, and the meaning he attached to it, and that he feared it could not be doubted, that whatever may have been the personal wishes of the Sultan and his Ministers, the latter sought to reserve the right of dealing with Mussulman converts to Christianity according to their view of the law, not as he believed it to be found in the Koran, but as explained by its more esteemed commentators.

Fresh remonstrances were now addressed to the Porte. Lord Clarendon sent peremptory instructions to the ambassador as to how he was to act. He said that the subject of these executions required to be pressed upon the serious and immediate attention of the Turkish Ministers. The Ottoman Government could not expect that the great Christian Powers of Europe, which were then making gigantic efforts and submitting to enormous sacrifices to save the Turkish empire from ruin and destruction, would permit the continuance of a law which was not only a standing insult to them, but a source of cruel persecution to their co-religionists, and that they never would consent to perpetuate it by the successes of their arms. They were entitled to demand, and her

Majesty's Government distinctly demanded, that no punishment whatever should be inflicted on the Mohammedan who might become a Christian, whether originally a Mohammedan or originally a Christian, any more than punishment attached to a Christian who embraced Mohammedanism. Armed with these instructions, and supported by the French and Austrian ambassadors, Lord Stratford drew up an energetic note embodying the English demands, which he sent in the autumn to Fuad Pasha, the Ottoman Secretary of State. A personal interview soon followed, at which, after fully discussing the reforms proposed for the amelioration of the condition of the Christians in the Turkish empire, he told the ambassador that the only punishment to which offenders were liable on the score of religion was that inflicted on persons guilty of blasphemy, by which he meant the offence of publicly disparaging the Prophet of Mecca, or either of his inspired predecessors, Moses or Christ. Whatever may have been the Mohammedan theory, those who witnessed the executions at Aleppo and Adrianople emphatically declared that the victims were put to death, not for blasphemy, but for apostasy. Aali Pasha, the Grand Vizier, whom Lord Stratford saw on the same day, also expressed himself in favour of religious liberty, but intimated that the law of the Koran was stubborn, if not unalterable; that the Christians were more intolerant and acrimonious among themselves than were the Turks toward them; and that, having regard to the ignorance and fanaticism which still prevailed in some parts of the Ottoman empire, it would be more prudent, and perhaps in the end more effectual, to allow it to become obsolete, than to offend national prejudices by repealing it at once. Lord Stratford's proposals were received with fewer appearances of irritation and repugnance by both Ministers than he had ventured to expect.

After further diplomatic negotiations, a conclusion was arrived at which, although it left the law of the Koran unrepealed, because the Turks said that it was beyond the power of the Sultan to alter it, provided for the absolute freedom from punishment of all renegades from Islamism. Writing to Lord Clarendon early in 1856, Lord Stratford said that the Porte, as the Turkish Ministers alleged, had determined that there should not be any more religious persecution in Turkey, and no further effusion of blood on account of Christian opinions; but that it was thought impossible for the Sultan either to abrogate Mohammedan law or to make any public declaration equivalent to its abrogation in that respect. They assured him that they were sincerely desirous of meeting his wishes to the utmost of their power, and entreated his forbearance, urging that time and the progress of opinion would not fail to complete the work

of humanity. A memorandum had been addressed by him to the Porte embodying the reforms demanded, and in the answer agreed upon, the fifth article was that "as all forms of religion are and shall be freely professed in the Ottoman dominions, no subject of his Majesty the Sultan shall be hindered in the exercise of his religion; that he shall not be in any way annoyed on this account; and that no one shall be compelled to change his religion." With this he was obliged to rest satisfied. Writing to Lord Clarendon, he said that the Porte affirmed and acknowledged its former declaration respecting renegades, and expressly extended it so as to include all Mussulman converts to Christianity, though not mentioned by name. Taken in connection with the articles recommended by England and France and Austria, which had been adopted by the Porte, and inserted in the firman invested with a Hatti Sheriff, he thought that it covered the whole ground of his demands. On the same day that this letter was written, Fuad Pasha wrote officially to the ambassador acknowledging the great services which the English Government had rendered to the Ottoman nation, and expressing the sincere desire of the Porte to meet as far as possible the friendly representations of her allies by satisfactory measures. Being well acquainted with the spirit of the age, he accordingly hastened, with the imperial sanction, to communicate the decision arrived at concerning the immunities of the Christians. The assurances formerly given to the English and French Governments respecting renegades were renewed and confirmed afresh, while an additional guarantee was declared and made known that the terms of the decision at that time adopted would be held to comprise absolutely all renegades.

By the ninth article of the treaty of Paris, the Sultan, on the advice of the English Government, and in order to avoid the appearance of yielding to the demands of Russia, bound himself to issue a firman ameliorating the condition of his subjects without distinction of religion or race, while at the same time the contracting Powers renounced the right of interfering, either collectively or separately, in the relations between the Sultan and his subjects, and in the internal administration of his empire. The treaty was signed on March 30, the firman having been published on February 21. Among the privileges which it guaranteed was the right of Christians to build churches, hospitals and schools, and to hold cemeteries, after permission had been obtained from the Porte through the recognized heads of the different ecclesiastical bodies. All distinctions between Turks and Christians were abolished, and the latter were admitted to the privilege of serving in the army. By the advice of Lord Stratford orders were given to the Grand Vizier to cause

the firman to be published in the most solemn manner, both in Constantinople and in all parts of the empire, and to take all necessary measures to ensure that the orders it contained were carried out with the most rigorous punctuality.

Another great advance had now been made in the cause of religious liberty, of which one result has been that up to the present time no-one has suffered death for his opinions. The expectations of those who hoped for the best have not, however, been realized; and much still remains to be done to secure the rights which the Sultan had promised. Whatever may have been his intention and that of his Ministers as to the amelioration of the general condition of his subjects, and of the Christians in particular, little if any progress has been made, owing to the ignorance and fanaticism so widely prevalent among the Mohammedans. The subject of religious liberty now assumes a new phase. In the summer of 1864 a very disagreeable circumstance occurred in Constantinople, which caused Sir Henry Bulwer, then English ambassador, to interfere in his official capacity with the view of protecting missionaries and some Mussulman converts from what seemed unjust aggression on the part of the Turkish authorities. The principle really at stake was whether they would allow missions to the Mohammedans to be openly carried on in the empire. An agent of the Propagation Society had rented a schoolroom where, on Sundays, services in Turkish were held by the Rev. Edward Williams, an ordained Mussulman convert. A room had also been hired in one of the khans, or Oriental inns, where lectures were delivered pointing out the absurdity of Mohammedanism, and where controversial works were sold or given away. The British and Foreign Bible Society also had a *dépôt* for the sale of Bibles, which was held in the name of an English agent, and the system of colportage was in full operation in public places, in the streets, and on board the steamboats. Four or five persons, said to be Mussulman converts, were actively engaged in this work. In the beginning of July, suddenly and without any notice, the Turkish authorities closed the rooms of the Propagation Society and the *dépôt* of the Bible Society, and arrested, as was reported, nine converts, but the official return obtained from the Porte by the Hon. William Stuart, the *chargé d'affaires*, in December, showed that there were in reality only seven. The English clerical agent of the Propagation Society, as he was about to enter his room, was roughly put back by the sentinel who had been posted there, and was detained for a short time. As he supposed, Williams was arrested on the same day, but was liberated almost immediately, with an apology. The others were thrown into prison; amongst whom was one called Ahmed Agà, but all were sub-

sequently set free after they had recanted, as some people reported, but in reality because it was found on inquiry that they had nothing to do with the preaching. Ahned was exiled to Adrianople, and upon his way thither he was again arrested, apparently by mistake, and thrown into prison, from which he was liberated by the Porte at the instance of Sir Henry Bulwer. He afterwards returned to Constantinople, and suffered no further annoyance.

When the English ambassador was made aware of the facts, he at once remonstrated against this outrage upon the rights guaranteed by the firman of 1856. It was ascertained that the shops were rented by British subjects, and as under the capitulations they could not be closed without a previous intimation to the ambassador, the Turks found that they had made a mistake, and tendered an ample apology for their precipitate action. When the rooms were searched, in that belonging to the Propagation Society Bibles only were found, but in those of the agent of the Church Missionary Society considerable quantities of controversial works against Islamism, written by Dr. Pfander, and MSS. belonging to him, of which the object was clear, were discovered. Among the latter was a treatise called "*Mizan ul Haqq*," or "*The Balance or Truth*," exposing the absurdities of Mohammedanism, which, before publication, had been submitted to the American missionaries, who, while approving the arguments, declined to receive or sanction it on the ground that they did not believe that violent attacks upon Mohammedanism, however well founded in truth, could be advantageous to the interests of Christianity in Turkey. Sir Henry Bulwer coincided in this opinion.

A long correspondence then ensued between him and the Turkish authorities on the one hand, and the missionaries, the Evangelical Society of Constantinople, and certain religious societies in England which were desirous of raising the wind a little, on the other. In reference to the latter, it is painful to have to record that they assailed his action and misrepresented his conduct in a way which, to impartial persons, seems wholly unjustifiable. The Turks offered explanations as to what they would and what they would not permit to be done by Protestant missionaries. Lecturing and preaching against Mohammedanism in khans could not be allowed; neither could public or private efforts to overturn the religion of the State be sanctioned, because they held that such proceedings were calculated to cause public disorder. Neither would they permit the Bible or controversial books to be thrust ostentatiously, any more than the Koran, in the face of the people, who might thereby be offended and exasperated. Sir Henry Bulwer fully admitted that the Turkish Government, like other Governments, had the right of regulating

the publication and sale of books intended for circulation in its dominions, especially when they contained attacks upon the religion of the State. On the other hand, they declared that they would sanction all public places of worship and private houses when used for Protestant services, and would permit the circulation of the Bible if carried on unostentatiously, as had been hitherto freely allowed in the Turkish dominions; but they denied that the Bible Society had thereby acquired any right to sell or give away the Christian Scriptures, because there was no document in existence granting any such privilege, while, if asserted, it might be withdrawn altogether. Any Mussulman who thought proper might become a Protestant, and would be protected in the exercise of his religious rights, but no such person, any more than other Christians, could be allowed to go about reviling the religion which he had abandoned. Aali Pasha, the Grand Vizier, in a letter to Mr. Stuart, said that the Imperial Government gave entire liberty to all its subjects to practise their religious duties, provided that no one encroached upon the religion of another, and that Protestants had their churches and schools where they were exposed to no interference. He hoped that the necessity which had arisen for closing the book-shops would be a warning to the missionaries to employ for the future greater moderation in their actions. In a subsequent despatch to M. Mussurus, the Turkish ambassador in London, he reiterated that every one was at liberty to profess his own religion and follow his own form of worship; that there was no restraint upon any one; that all creeds could erect their places of worship and enjoy full liberty; and that the sacred books of all religions were printed and published without obstruction in different parts of the empire. He quoted significantly an order of the Queen in Council, addressed to the British Embassy at the time of the formation of the High Consular Court, which provided that every British subject who should render himself guilty of turning into derision or of publicly insulting any religion established or professed in Turkey, or should voluntarily commit any act tending to draw upon such religion or its ceremonies, its worship or its practices, hatred, ridicule or contempt, would render himself liable to be punished by fine or imprisonment with hard labour. The despatch concluded with the observation that the free sale and circulation of the Bible continued, and would always continue, to be authorized in the empire. As the Ottoman Government further avowed its readiness to observe inviolably the firman of 1856, Lord Russell expressed himself satisfied with these declarations, and closed the controversy.

During the correspondence between Sir Henry Bulwer and the missionaries some curious facts came to light respecting their method of action. The "*Mizan ul Haqq*" had been originally

published in Persian at Calcutta, to which a reply was written in Turkish by a certain Ishag Effendi in an abusive style. In answer to this, the former was republished at Constantinople in Turkish by Dr. Pfander. The MS. was submitted by him to Sir Henry Bulwer, who, in July, 1863, wrote to warn him that the work was of such a character in attacking the Mohammedan religion, that if the Government should think proper to prohibit its circulation, and punish those who were concerned in it, he would have no right to interfere. He added that such publications in a country like Turkey might probably lead to great disturbances, and would rather tend to counteract than aid the cause of missions. In despite of this warning, the work was published abroad, and was imported into Turkey for circulation, where within a year it was seized as the ambassador had foreseen. To the remonstrance of the ambassador, the only reply which Dr. Pfander was able to offer was that the Turkish Government had never informed him, either directly or indirectly through the British Embassy, that they had any objection to it. The title of the book in Turkish was "The Balance of Truth," but among the works seized by the Turks at this time, of which a list was sent by Sir Henry Bulwer to Lord Russell, it was called "Demonstration of the Falsity of the Mussulman Faith." Dr. Pfander admitted this variation to the ambassador. On another occasion, when a missionary was assuring his Excellency that the books he was circulating were not attacks upon Mohammedanism, he asked to be allowed to see a list of them. The one which stood first on it was the very same book, which the ambassador thought was hardly consistent with what had been just told him, but the missionary replied that the titles of the work in English and Turkish were different. The "Mizan ul Haqq" has since been translated into Arabic, for use in the Palestine mission of the Church Missionary Society, and seems to have contributed to bring about its complete failure.

For many years American Congregational ministers have carried on missions to the Ansairiyeh, known in the time of the Crusades as the Assassins, a tribe whose territory extends along the seacoast from the north of Mount Lebanon to the Taurus, including an area of about 12,000 square miles. These people are pagans and not Mohammedans, and are divided into two sects, of which one worships the sun, and the other the moon. Their religion is kept secret, into the mysteries of which none are initiated until an oath has been taken that the rites will never be divulged. Sir Henry Elliot, who was ambassador at Constantinople in 1873, said that a more legitimate field for missionary operations could hardly be imagined than that offered by this degraded population, but it has never been occupied by

the English Church. The American missionaries had long been labouring among them, had established schools, and made some converts to Christianity. According to a report from Consul-General Eldridge to the ambassador on September 17 in that year, three of the teachers were suddenly summoned before the Kaimakan of Lattakia, who caused them to be arrested on the pretext that they were evading the conscription, to which under the firman of 1856 Mohammedans and Christians were alike liable. They were taken to Tripoli, from whence they were removed to Beyrout, and then to Damascus, to join the regiment to which they were to be attached. It was asserted on their behalf that they had regularly paid the tax exacted from the Christians as the condition of exemption from military service, but it was afterwards found that they had no proper receipts to show. The Turks said that they were deserters; and the missionaries, that they were arrested solely because they were Christians, after no notice had been taken of them for twelve or thirteen years. They were sent to a regiment composed exclusively of Mohammedans, and great cruelty was used to compel them to abandon their religion, but to no purpose. A voluminous correspondence ensued about these men between the English ambassador and the American Minister on the one hand, and the Porte on the other, although as far as can be made out from the papers presented to Parliament, Sir Henry Elliot had no right to interfere, because the missionaries were not personally aggrieved, and some of them were not British subjects. The case did not look well for the Turks, but they seem to have had sufficient justification from the law in dealing with their own people. The end of the matter was that the conscripts, after having been detained in durance for more than eight months, and exposed to harsh usage, did not obtain their discharge from the army; the only point conceded being that they were transferred to another regiment, composed of men of different religions.

Another case of what the American missionaries represented to be gross persecution occurred at Marash, in the summer of 1874. When bringing it under the notice of Lord Derby, who was then Foreign Secretary, the Rev. J. Davis, Secretary of the Evangelical Alliance, said that a Moslem named Mustapha, having become secretly convinced of the truth of Christianity, had refrained from declaring himself openly, fearing the consequences from the Mohammedans in the town. His son, a boy of sixteen or seventeen years of age, who had less apprehension, began to attend school and church; and soon after, the father followed his example by appearing at public worship. Both were violently abused by their Mussulman neighbours, but after



a time the storm subsided, and it was hoped that no further evil would befall them. One evening, however, both were suddenly arrested by the police, and without being allowed to make any preparation were bound, like robbers, and marched off under a strong guard to Aleppo, at a distance of five days' journey. The three remaining children were taken from their mother by order of the Governor-General of Syria, and handed over to the care of one of the most bigoted Mohammedan families in Marash. As reported by the missionaries, the arrest of the father and son seemed to be a clear case of religious persecution.

This business involved a long diplomatic correspondence between the Porte, Sir Henry Elliot, the American missionaries, and others who thought themselves called on to interfere. The American Minister was prevented by his instructions from taking any official part in adjusting difficulties caused by the attempts of his countrymen to convert the Mohammedans, so that it devolved upon the British ambassador to assert in this case also the great principle of religious liberty, although, as Mustapha was a Turkish subject, it is clear that by the ninth article of the Treaty of Paris he had no legal right to interfere. During the progress of the negotiations, the American Minister was distinctly told by the Turks that conversion from Islamism was impossible, and that the firman of 1856 was never intended to apply to Mohammedans. The Grand Vizier also declared that the Government would stop the printing and sale of the Bible in the Turkish empire. The Porte said that Mustapha had been arrested at Marash to secure his personal safety against the fanaticism of his Mohammedan neighbours; but this did not justify the ill-treatment to which he was afterwards exposed. Ultimately, Sir Henry Elliot obtained his release, with permission to reside anywhere in the Turkish empire except at Marash.

Writing to Lord Derby in April, he said that while the Ottoman Government guaranteed the free exercise of their religion to all subjects of the Sultan, the right of making proselytes from the religion of the State neither had been nor was intended to be given. When permission to circulate the Bible was granted, the Porte believed that it was intended for the use of the Christian populations, but had afterwards learned that the Turkish version was prepared chiefly for distribution among the Mohammedans, with the object of converting them to Christianity. The Turkish Ministers had also informed him that the injudicious proceedings of some of the colporteurs had excited angry feelings among the Mussulman public. The situation had been further complicated because complaints had been made to the Government about the matter by the heads of the different religious bodies, and especially by the Latin Patriarch.

During the proceedings arising out of this difficulty, much valuable information about the state of the Protestant community in the Turkish dominions and their grievances was obtained by Sir Henry Elliot, from their Vakeel Hagop Effendi, at Constantinople, and as he possessed better information about his co-religionists than any other person, it is evident that what he said was more reliable than the statements of missionaries. According to him their two principal grievances were the inferior position assigned to himself at the official receptions of the Sultan, and the exclusion of the Protestants from the provincial councils. Both were ultimately removed through the good offices of the English ambassador. When the effort had been successful, the Vakeel expressed his gratitude to him for helping to obtain for his community from the Government a greater amount of consideration than had ever before been conceded to it. He also told him that any jealousy of the native Protestants which still existed, was caused by the indiscreet zeal of the missionaries, whose proselytizing efforts excited on the part of the authorities an aversion of which the consequences had been visited on the whole community. He distinctly affirmed that at that time there was no persecution of his co-religionists going on in any part of the empire, and that the case at Marash, if it could be so called, was an isolated instance. With regard to the Ansairiyeh Christians, he said that they had no right to exemption from the conscription, and that he should extremely deplore such being granted to them, because the inevitable result would be that multitudes among the numerous races of the empire would make a nominal profession of Christianity in order to escape the responsibility of military service. He was able also to furnish the ambassador with some details of the history of the Christian Mustapha, whose case had attracted so much attention. Instead of his being a recent convert, as was represented, both he and his wife had lived in Constantinople as Protestants for ten or twelve years, where no notice was taken of them by any one. If means of earning a livelihood could have been obtained for him there, he would not have returned to Marash, where he had reason to dread the known fanaticism of the people. What he expected actually happened, and being assailed and in great danger, he was arrested by the authorities and sent to Aleppo, but no justification could be pleaded for the harsh usage he had received from them. The Vakeel attributed his persecution to not having at his baptism assumed a Christian name instead of the Mohammedan Mustapha, which, being one of the seven titles of the Prophet representing his qualities, when borne by a renegade was a cause of offence to the Turks. He thought that nothing was gained by unnecessarily courting their hostility, instead of following the example of other converts.

He further informed Sir Henry Elliot that when Protestant missions were first established, in Turkey, the missionaries and their work were looked upon not only as harmless but benevolent, while those who joined them were regarded with no feelings of animosity. When they began to organize religious communities and take aggressive steps, sectarian hatred was roused, and persecution was set on foot against them by the heads of the native Christian Churches, and with the greater effect, because being recognized by firman as a distinct religious body, they could not be expelled from the places where they lived. The Imperial Government soon interfered to stop the oppression of one Christian community by another, and measures were taken to secure the liberty of Protestants, which in fact gave to them independent character and influence. All subsequent cases of alleged persecution by the authorities must be viewed in the light of this statement, and as proselytism among the Mussulmans had not then, and has not even now, assumed such magnitude as to attract any public attention, supposed cases of ill-usage for, conscience sake must be regarded as isolated, and each must be judged by itself when viewed in connection with its own surroundings. Up to 1874 the Vakeel only knew of twelve persons who had been converted from Mohammedanism to Christianity. Of these, Mustapha, whose case attracted so much attention, was one. The second was Selim Effendi, who, in the name of Edward Williams, with his wife and children, was baptized at Malta. He was afterwards ordained, and for a considerable time preached Christianity in Constantinople without being molested by any one. Kruir, who had at one time been an active colporteur, was at that time practising law in the courts of justice, and while making no secret of his religious faith, he never on that account experienced any annoyance. Hameli Effendi, nephew of the President of the Council of State, was baptized retaining his Mussulman name, but his friends having taken offence at the action of the missionaries, succeeded in inducing him to return to Mohammedanism. Shakir Effendi, another convert, also returned, and died a Moslem in his own family. Mahmud, another convert, married an Englishwoman, and died a Christian in the service of the Propagation Society, without ever being interfered with by the Government. Martui and Ali were Persian converts, but both proved worthless, as will appear hereafter. Aali Effendi, who was employed at the Protestant Chancery, was baptized, but soon went back to Islamism. Ahmed, of Cesarea, was baptized with his wife and children, indiscreetly retaining his Mussulman name. During a period of excitement, caused by an idle rumour that 70,000 Mohammedans had become Christians, he was exiled to Adrianople.

Melhon was baptized with his wife and children, and although arrested was detained only for a few days, and with his family had subsequently remained entirely free from molestation. Ibrahim, who was baptized by the Armenians, never complained of being persecuted. Some few others had been baptized by the Greeks and Roman Catholics, but the Vakeel had never heard of any of them being exposed to serious annoyance. Of the twelve, five seem to have been insincere converts.

He assured Sir Henry Elliot that both the Government and the people were well aware that in Constantinople places were open where religious services were held expressly for the benefit of Mohammedan converts, and that no one ever heard of their being attacked or molested. Colportage and other missionary operations were carried on as freely as in any civilized country. He said that the subject of the registration of converts from Islamism was a delicate one. The firman constituting the Protestant community, in his opinion, only authorized the Vakeel to enter in his books the names of those who separated themselves from the jurisdiction of the Patriarchs, but not withstanding he had accepted those already specified. Williams held property under his new name, although every one was aware that he was a renegade. Kruir and Melhon were also registered, but he had felt a difficulty about Ahmed, Mahmud, and Mustapha, because they retained their Mohammedan names. To have entered them would only have excited the jealousy and ill-will of the dominant race, while, on the other hand, refusing to do so virtually put them in the position of outlaws. In the latter case there was great hardship, but he felt that it would not counterbalance the certain calamity which would be otherwise entailed both on themselves and on the Protestant community. The Vakeel was not prepared to overtask the clemency of the Imperial Government, when there was a way of avoiding the difficulty, rightly thinking that those who had put Ahmed and the others in the position of outlaws were responsible for the situation.

Along with these troubles the Turks further showed their dislike to foreign missionaries by suddenly closing a school at Acca belonging to the Church Missionary Society, which lost no time in complaining to the Foreign Secretary that their rights had been invaded. To this the answer was that it had been opened without the necessary permission having been first obtained under the terms of the firman of 1856. Memorials from different societies were forwarded to Lord Russell, containing statements in some cases not as accurate as they might have been, each urging upon his attention the importance of vigorously asserting the right of religious liberty in Turkey, and of

obtaining the redress of the grievances complained of. The Evangelical Alliance sent an influential deputation to Constantinople, to present a petition to the Sultan himself, but they were refused admission to his presence on the advice of his Ministers, in which Sir Henry Elliot coincided, and were obliged to return to England without accomplishing anything. Through the intervention of the ambassador, permission to proceed with the printing of the Turkish version of the Bible, which had been suspended for several years, was now fully conceded by the Porte.

In October, 1879, another act of intolerance on the part of the Turkish authorities showed how little they were disposed to respect the rights guaranteed by firman and the declarations of former Ministers of State. Sir Henry Layard was then ambassador at Constantinople, and the Marquis of Salisbury was Foreign Secretary. About the end of September the Rev. Dr. Koelle, a German who had been in the employment of the Church Missionary Society before it withdrew its mission from Constantinople, was engaged in translating into Turkish religious tracts with the help of a Mohammedan Ulema, called Ahmed Tewfik Effendi. The latter was a man of considerable attainments, who had been tutor in several distinguished families, was then master of a grammar-school and professor at a Mohammedan college. One afternoon Dr. Koelle, having finished his work for the day, was returning home, when he was followed by a person who requested his attendance at the police-office, where he was required to show the contents of a small bag he was carrying in his hand. Being threatened with force if he refused, he opened it, and produced the MSS. upon which he and the Ulema had been engaged. After they had been taken from him, he was conducted to several places, but was finally liberated and allowed to return home. About the same time Ahmed was also arrested and thrown into prison. As soon as they were made aware of the facts, the Church Missionary Society applied to Lord Salisbury, who directed Sir Henry Layard to take whatever steps might be necessary to procure the restoration of the papers and the liberation of the Ulema. An angry correspondence then ensued with the Turkish Government, but they would neither answer the letters of the ambassador nor comply with his demands, until at last he found it necessary to break off diplomatic relations with the Porte. He formally demanded that Dr. Koelle's papers should be returned to him, that the Ulema should be set at liberty without punishment, and that Hassan Pasha, the Minister of Police, should be dismissed. He was energetically supported by Lord Salisbury, who said that these outrageous proceedings were a direct viola-

tion of the sixty-second article of the Treaty of Berlin, by which the Porte engaged to maintain the principle of religious liberty in its widest scope, and the freedom and outward exercise of all forms of worship, and guaranteed that no hindrance should be offered either to the organizations of the various communions, or to their relations with their spiritual heads. The Turkish ambassador in London called upon him, and asked that Sir Henry Layard's demands should not be countenanced, but to no purpose. He was told that the Ulema had been arrested, not because he had attempted to convert any Mussulman, or because he had published any documents or opinions contrary to the Mohammedan faith, but because there was found in his possession a version of the Bible in Turkish, and some other Christian publications. He was told that the matter would have to be settled at Constantinople, and that the English ambassador was fully supported by his Government. M. Musurus maintained that there was a great difference between religious liberty and the liberty of proselytizing, and that while Turkey was bound by firman and treaty to maintain the former, she retained the right and was under the necessity of preventing the propagation of any opinions insulting to the feelings of those who professed the religion of the State. Lord Salisbury declined to accept this distinction, and said that even if it could be upheld it was not applicable in the present case, because the Ulema had not propagated any opinions hostile to Mohammedanism.

From henceforward Sir Henry Layard communicated directly with the Sultan himself. At an interview on January 1 the latter told him that Dr. Koelle's papers should be returned, that he would issue an order to the Sheik ul Islam to make out a *fetwah* pardoning Ahmed, by which he knew that he had been condemned to death, that no injury should be done to him, but that owing to the excitement among the people he would have to be sent away from Constantinople for a time. He had actually been condemned, and the Mohammedan papers were furiously calling out for his execution, suggesting that it should be by crucifixion, and calling him a renegade, traitor, and a hypocrite, who was no longer deserving of the name of a Turk. The decision of the Council of State had been opposed by Mahmoud Nedim Pasha, who declared that the sentence was illegal, and could not be carried into effect, because the Ulemas who passed it were not unanimous as the laws required them to be. The Sultan, at the same interview, also said that the Minister of Police should write a letter declaring that he had nothing to do with the arrest of Dr. Koelle, and that the officer who had been guilty of taking these illegal proceedings should be dismissed. He told the ambassador that the Sheik ul Islam

or any other Mohammedan might turn Christian, and that no harm should befall him, of which observation he immediately made a note. Before leaving the presence he took occasion to warn the Sultan that the arbitrary arrests and denunciations which were taking place, were endangering his popularity and might entail serious consequences.

After a few days the papers were returned, and the promised letter was received from the Minister of Police. Although it was not altogether satisfactory, because it did not state clearly that he had nothing whatever to do with the arrest and the seizure of the MSS., Sir Henry Layard deemed it better to accept it than continue the discussion any further. When returning the papers to Dr. Koelle, he impressed upon him the necessity for abstaining from publishing, circulating and selling books and tracts containing attacks upon the Mohammedan religion, or anything offensive to Mussulmans, which might lead to public scandal or disorder. He warned him that if he did so he would probably be unable to protect him against the consequences, adding at the same time that he had received from the Sultan the most solemn assurances of his intention to secure to all his subjects the fullest religious freedom. Dr. Koelle promised that he would scrupulously act upon the advice given him, and said that he was quite aware of the necessity for avoiding the publication and distribution of works calculated to excite the religious feelings or prejudices of the Mohammedan population. In the account of this transaction furnished to their supporters by the Church Missionary Society, they deemed it expedient to omit all notice of what passed at the interview between the ambassador and Dr. Koelle, because it is obvious that if Sir Henry Layard's views were acted upon, missions to the Mohammedans in Turkey would be impossible. Ahmed was still detained in custody, but with the consent of the ambassador he was in a short time sent to the Island of Scio, under the pretext that if he were released at once his life might be in danger from the violence of the populace. He was ultimately set free, and came to England.

The subsequent history of this man is not satisfactory. In their report for 1880 the Church Missionary Society said that he was then fully convinced of the truth of Christianity, and although still unbaptized, that he was earnestly desirous of making it known to his countrymen. They said that he was a man of great learning, that he had been of the highest consideration among the Ulemas of Constantinople, and that he might have looked forward to the most important offices open to them. After some interval he was baptized in London, and was employed by the Society in making translations into Turkish. In

1883 he was sent, along with the Rev. F. H. Klein, to Egypt to open a mission to the Mohammedans in Cairo, and soon after relapsed into Islamism.

Sir Henry Layard believed that the whole of the proceedings had been ordered by the Sultan himself, and for that reason did not press his demand for the dismissal of Hafiz Pasha, the Minister of Police, who soon after was rewarded with the grand cordon of the Order of the Medjidieh. The Porte issued an official note justifying the proceedings against Dr. Koelle and the sentence on Ahmed Tewfik, while acknowledging that the concessions to the demands of the English ambassador were due to "the clemency of the Sultan" and "his regard for England." Sir Henry Layard, in a letter to Lord Salisbury taking a survey of the efforts of his predecessors at Constantinople to secure religious freedom in Turkey, noticed the striking similarity of the case of the Armenian youth who had been beheaded and that of Ahmed, and declared that if the fanaticism of those who had denounced the latter had not been checked in time, he would undoubtedly have shared the same fate. From 1843 to 1879 Mussulman intolerance was declining, as far as the public acts of the Government were concerned, and, in fact, had virtually died out. But in the latter year there was a reactionary party, which being unable to understand the lessons of the past, wished to revive religious fanaticism, with the view of suppressing missionary efforts, and practically accomplished their purpose in Constantinople. In his official character the ambassador was firm, and succeeded for the moment in neutralizing its efforts, even though he had reason to believe that they were sanctioned by the Sultan himself.

On June 1, 1860, a series of questions was addressed to the British consuls in different parts of the Turkish empire by Sir Henry Bulwer, then ambassador at the Porte, with the view of ascertaining the condition of the Christian population. This step was taken owing to a remonstrance addressed by Russia to the English Government, which accused the Turks of the grossest intolerance and persecution. The replies of the consuls in Syria and Palestine throw some light on the missionary question, upon the relations existing between the native Christians and the Mohammedans, and the possible influence which the former may have upon the latter in the conversion of them to Christianity, and are the more valuable because they come from independent persons.

The answers of Mr. James Finn, who was then consul at Jerusalem, show the state of the Christians in Palestine and the degree of liberty they enjoyed. After giving an estimate of the population, with the relative proportion of Mussulmans,



Jews, and Christians, of which the second and third taken together only constituted a small minority, he said that the last were on a footing of equality with their Moslem neighbours in respect to the tenure of landed property, while on the other hand impediments were sometimes cast in the way of their exercising trades which had long been in the hands of Mohammedans. There was greater activity among the Christian than the Moslem peasantry, as was evidenced in their superior houses, food, and dress, which, however, did not mitigate the contempt with which they were regarded by their neighbours. At that time the Medglisses, or local courts, were composed of both Mohammedan and Christian judges, but in an unequal proportion, the former preponderating to such an extent as virtually to deprive the latter of their legitimate share in the administration of justice. Some subterfuge was generally found for refusing to receive the evidence of a Christian against a Moslem, while that of parties who were not Mohammedans was always accepted against each other. Previous to the Egyptian occupation the condition of the Christians had been little better than that of serfs, while during that period they enjoyed greater freedom than they have since at any time possessed. After the expulsion of the Egyptians there was a reaction in favour of Mohammedan ascendancy, which was somewhat modified by the advancing influence of the consulates and of Europeans in general. During the Crimean war their condition again improved. Subsequently there was another reaction, which was in most respects anti-Christian, while on the part of the Pashas it was also anti-European. As no offices of trust, whether in the local government, in the army, or police, were given to the Christians, in defiance of the firman of 1856, they were thereby made to feel that they were essentially the governed class and that the Mohammedans were their rulers. They could build churches after obtaining an order from the Porte, but when permission was obtained it was usually couched in such vague terms as to give rise to needless vexations, and frequently to long delay. Whenever they were oppressed the trouble usually began with the populace. The Government took no means either to punish the ringleaders or repress the disturbances, which never broke out till the fanaticism of the governing Pasha was manifest; of which the consul furnished some noteworthy examples. On the other hand, the Mohammedans had no more dislike to Protestants than to other Christians, whom, indeed, they viewed with less antipathy. When the latter were exposed to persecution, it always arose from and was conducted by ecclesiastics of the other Christian sects, which generally employed the Mohammedans to carry out their aims.

A remarkable example of this occurred in 1844 in the schism of Hasbeya, a village near Damascus, which arose from a dispute about the payment of taxes mixed up with a religious motive. The seceders, who withdrew from the Greek Church, were excommunicated by the Patriarch, and all persons were forbidden to trade or hold communication with them. The violent persecution to which they were exposed was ultimately stopped by the Government, through the intervention of Sir Stratford Canning, who furnished to Lord Aberdeen full information, which was afterwards published in a parliamentary paper. The grievances of which the Christians complained were not generally caused by their own ecclesiastical authorities, although in the Greek and Latin Churches, of which the heads were for the most part foreigners, there was a tendency to prevent the advancement of the native congregations. While the ignorance among all classes was deplorable, education was eagerly sought for. If schools were established where a good general education could be provided, and less importance was attached to teaching mere forms of religion according to the respective systems of Mohammedans, Jews, and Christians, Mr. Finn thought that the tendency would be to bring about a general weakening of religious distinctions, and soften the hostility by which each sect in the centres where it predominated was sharpened into animosity against its neighbours. He had never heard of a conversion to Mohammedanism except of two Jewesses, of whom one returned to her friends in a few days. On the other hand, he had known cases of Mussulmans embracing Christianity, and was aware at that time of a Moslem convert who was living in Jerusalem free from all molestation.

The tenor of the replies of Mr. Noel Moore, who was then consul at Beyrout, was practically the same. In his district, which included a population of upwards of 200,000 souls, he said that the Christians found no difficulty in following their religious observances, and that whenever they were oppressed the Government was to blame. When Protestants were annoyed and ill-treated, the persecution originated with the other Christian sects, which, being more numerous, wealthy and influential, usually found means of gaining over to their purposes the Turkish authorities. On the other hand, the grievances of which the Christians complained were frequently caused by their own ecclesiastics, who pleaded in extenuation that they were under the moral compulsion of the Pashas, upon whom their tenure of office depended. He had never heard of the Mohammedans attempting to make converts by force or in any other way.

On March 6, 1867, a return was moved for in the House of

Commons of copies of any papers or despatches from her Majesty's diplomatic or consular agents in the Turkish empire, which showed how the stipulations agreed on by the British Government and that of Turkey with regard to the treatment of the Christian subjects of the Sultan had been observed. These documents were published in a Blue-book. They throw considerable light upon their condition at that time, and prove that many of the old grievances still remained without redress. Among these was the refusal of Christian evidence in courts of law, of which Mr. Dalryell, the consul at Rustchuk, furnished an illustration. The Kaimakan or Mudir would refuse to accept the evidence of a Christian, and would then call upon the other members of the court to attach their seals to a *procès-verbal*, stating that the accused was discharged because there was no proof; the fact being, not that there was none, but that there was no Mussulman evidence. The official document would be forwarded in due course to the Governor-General; and if complaints were made, and the matter were further inquired into, he would send it on to the Porte, duly approved by him, which would produce it to show that the proceedings had been perfectly regular. The difficulty about evidence was frequently got over by the Christian litigants giving a gratuity to some Mohammedans who were ready to swear whatever was needed. The Christian members of the court were compelled to assent to what they knew to be a denial of justice, because from long habits of subserviency they were afraid to protest, and because their bishops and head men being frequently mixed up in speculations with the Turkish authorities, had no other alternative than to attach their seals. Such unfair proceedings were among the means employed by the local courts for oppressing the Christians. Mr. Dalryell also said that he had travelled in Anatolia on the Russian and Persian frontier, and that he was able to affirm from personal observation that any attempt to enforce the firman of 1856 at Kars, or in any other place where the Ottoman population was intensely fanatical, would be perfectly impossible.

The statement of Mr. Cumberland, consul at Smyrna, was that there, and in the other large towns where there were consular agents, Christian evidence was received in most of the courts, but that in the interior it was uniformly refused; so that a non-Mussulman litigant, in fact, could never obtain redress in any case, whether civil or criminal. He also said that while the religious privileges of the population in his district, as provided for by the firman of 1856, had been respected, in the remote parts of the country it had not been executed at all, and was virtually a dead-letter, because the life of a renegade would not

be safe for an instant, and because contempt for Christians was openly showed by word and action, without the possibility of any redress being obtained. Some of the Protestant Armenians had been assailed and persecuted, but it was afterwards found that the chiefs of the Christian communities had been the secret instigators. The social position of the Christian population continued inferior, because none of them were admitted into the army, because nearly all Government offices were filled by Mussulmans, and because the schools were reserved exclusively for Moslem children.

Mr. Rogers, acting consul-general at Beyrout, said that after a residence of nineteen years in the country, he was still unable to affirm that the Christian sects enjoyed perfect civil and religious liberty, or were on a footing of equality with their Mohammedan fellow-subjects, although their political state had been greatly improved. Until recently they had been looked upon almost in the light of serfs, who secured their liberty, lives, and property by the payment of a capitation fee, on receiving which the tax-gatherer would strike the unfortunate Christian in the face, as a sign of the superiority of the one and the subjection of the other. The efforts of the Government had been attended with some good results, but however desirous they might be of giving them the same political status as the Moslems, wherever the latter were in a great majority, as in Syria, the task seemed to be almost impossible. His opinion also was that Christian sects oppressed one another more than the Mohammedans did them. Sir A. Kemball said that, although at Bagdad Christians were exposed to the aversion and contempt inculcated by the Koran, they were not impeded or molested in the exercise of their religion, nor was there any marked distinction in the treatment they received from the authorities; in which latter opinion, Mr. Moore, consul at Jerusalem, coincided, while he thought that there was great room for improvement in the government of both them and their Mohammedan fellow-subjects. The Hon. Mr. Stuart described the Moslem as a man upon whom his religion had set his seal, which nothing could efface. It pervaded his whole life—individual, social, and political. It entered into all his motives, and regulated all his actions, admitting of no change, and allowing of no fraternity with others. Such was the character of educated Mussulmans; but the masses, although they knew little more of their religion than the pride and intolerance which it inculcated, were equally inaccessible and impracticable.

In a memorandum addressed to Lord Stanley, in 1867, referring to reforms in the Turkish empire, Fuad Pasha said that in no country in the world were the different forms of worship

celebrated with greater liberty, toleration, and publicity. He declared that no Christian or other non-Mussulman subject of the Sultan had ever been compelled to embrace the faith of Islam, and that the idea of Mussulman proselytism was unknown, while the only propagandism which existed in Turkey was that which the Christian forms of worship exercised with a liberty which had no limit except the necessities of public order. This official declaration evidently contains no allusion to missionary efforts for the conversion of the Mohammedans to Christianity, which the Ottoman Government does not appear ever to have recognized, and which in Palestine have never yet assumed an aggressive form.

Admitting the declaration of Fuad Pasha to be true, the consuls seem to have been unanimously of opinion that the Christians in the Asiatic dominions of the Sultan are still looked upon by the Mohammedans as an inferior race, notwithstanding the efforts of the Government to improve their condition. Their religious privileges are respected, but their social and political status seems to be much the same as it was before the invasion of Mehemet Ali. The aversion and contempt for them generated by Mohammedan intolerance, their exclusion from their proper share in the administration of justice, the impediments thrown in the way of their rising to the higher Government offices, and the tameness with which they submit to insult as witnessed by those who have lived among them, are proofs of their depressed and uninfluential position. The gulf separating them from the Moslems is as wide as ever it was, nor does there appear any prospect of an amalgamation of races hitherto irreconcilable and antagonistic. To employ the one for producing a religious impression on the other is hopeless and chimerical. If the dominant race is haughty and impracticable, the Christians are torn with internal dissensions, which alone would neutralize any possible influence they might exercise on their Mohammedan neighbours. Not only are the native Churches distracted by strife, but the small body of seceders who have joined the Church Missionary Society's agents from various motives and become nominally Protestant, is even more disunited, presenting by their divisions to the Mohammedan mind a spectacle not at all calculated to impress them with a favourable opinion of the Christian religion, and reflecting little credit upon the Society which cannot manage its own adherents.

The native Christian Churches in the Turkish empire are now, and have been for a long time, the prey of three foreign missionary associations, each endeavouring to make converts from them to its own system, while two avow that their ultimate object is through them to bring about the conversion of the

Mohammedans to Christianity. The oldest is the Latin. While the Catholic community is small, consisting principally of those who are dependent on the convents, the emissaries of the Pope have been for many years making efforts to gain over to the Roman obedience the adherents of the native Christian Churches, raising up schisms and causing confusion not well adapted to illustrate the true character of the Christian religion. Their labours have been to a considerable extent successful, because among the Oriental sects are the Papal Greek, the Papal Armenian, the Papal Syrian, the Papal Nestorian, the Papal Coptic, and the Papal Abyssinian, each of which retains most of its own usages, while professing what is little better than nominal allegiance to the Pope. The Jesuits have a famous printing establishment at Beyrout, from whence have issued translations of the Bible into Arabic and other Oriental languages, and numerous books for missionary purposes. There are also schools and multifarious agencies, of some of which the success was so great that it caused the late Dr. Barclay, when he was bishop in Jerusalem, considerable surprise. As the reports of these missions are little known in England, information about them is very imperfect. The Rev. Dr. Washbourne, President of the American College at Constantinople, estimated in 1882 the number of Roman Catholic agents at work in the Turkish Empire at 10,000.

For the last fifty years the American Congregational Board of Missions has been labouring among the native Christians with the view of raising up an orthodox Church, which they expect will ultimately become an instrumentality for the reform of the Oriental Churches, and for the conversion of the Mohammedans, to whom their efforts are not at present directed. The missionaries are cautious and sagacious men, and while prosecuting their labours with energy, have hitherto succeeded in avoiding collisions with the Turkish authorities. In a very interesting lecture on the Mohammedan missionary problem, delivered by Dr. Jessup in 1879, he gave a summary of the missions as they were in that year. He said that they had 30,000 adherents gathered from the native Christians in all parts of the Turkish empire; 11,000 children in their schools, of whom one-half were girls; printing-presses and newspapers in different places. The Bible had been translated into Arabic and eleven other languages, including Osmanli Turkish. Hundreds of works on religious and scientific subjects had been printed and circulated. They had founded two colleges, one at Constantinople, the other at Beyrout, six theological seminaries, five institutions of a higher order for the instruction of females, and had set on foot hundreds of common schools. Dr. Jessup's long experience as a

missionary in the East, led him to the conclusion that no direct efforts for the conversion of the Mohammedans were possible at the present time.

Compared with these results, the labours of the agents of the Church Missionary Society in the Turkish empire, during the last thirty-three years, present but a poor appearance. The history of their missions to the Mohammedans in Constantinople and Palestine, as told by them in their own reports, may not be acceptable to some of their supporters, but there is no good reason why Churchmen should not be made aware of the way in which their missionary work is being at present done in the East. These papers constitute a literature of a very peculiar character. They are slipshod, as if not edited by one responsible person, frequently incoherent, and not always consistent with themselves. They never afford full and complete information about the real state of the missions, something being often suppressed which it would not suit them to allow their supporters to know, as the Society itself has admitted in the prefatory observations to a mutilated report of the Palestine mission, published in the *Church Missionary Intelligencer* for September, 1881, and elsewhere. Comparing together the reports and papers for different years, there results a general view of the character of these missions which cannot be obtained by simply reading them for any one year, of which an illustration will be presently given in the history of the proceedings of the Society at Nazareth. Statements taken from the published documents of the Society have recently been made in the biography of the late Anglican Bishop of Jerusalem and in the daily press of so startling a character, that it was deemed expedient to put forth prompt contradictions of them, even though they involved the repudiation of its own official declarations. The situation became so awkward, and the loss of public character so serious, that a new policy has since been adopted, because the committee while failing to disavow inaccuracies in the press put forward on their behalf, after their attention has been formally called to them, are now endeavouring by a stubborn silence to avert the criticism which no missionary failure can ultimately escape. Efforts by the Society and its agents to stifle the truth and prevent the real state of their missions in the East from becoming known can only have the effect of stimulating to increased exertions those who are seeking to bring them to the test of public opinion.

The history of the operations of the Society in reference to the Mohammedans in the Turkish empire divides itself into two periods, in each of which they were conducted on different principles. In the former their efforts were direct, and in the latter indirect, because they began by aggression upon the Mussulmans in Constantinople, and afterwards altered their policy in

Palestine, not by attempting to reform the native Churches, but by introducing a schism among them, with the ultimate but hopeless object of producing an impression on the Mohammedan population. Their mission in the Turkish capital was avowedly intended to have a direct bearing upon the Turks, and the history of their proceedings, taken exclusively from their own papers, will show how it was managed and the results.

Operations were begun in Constantinople in 1857, when the prospect arising out of the firman of the previous year seemed to be favourable. In 1878 the work was finally abandoned, after a sum of upwards of £25,000 had been spent on the mission without any tangible results. During this period it was carried on principally by two German agents, both of whom got into difficulties with the authorities as already described, and were saved from ulterior consequences by the interposition of the English ambassador. One English clergyman, who had some knowledge of Turkish, was for a short time connected with the mission, but he soon returned to England. At first missionary efforts were made by carrying on a service in the vernacular in a schoolroom, by circulating the "*Mizan ul Haqq*," and by speaking privately to any Moslems who could be induced to listen, but none of the agents ventured to speak or teach openly against the Koran. They also occupied themselves in the work of translating tracts into Turkish, with a view to future operations. A dervish, who had been converted at Smyrna, was baptized at Constantinople in 1862, receiving the name of Zahiyah or John, but he does not appear in the list furnished to Sir Henry Bulwer by the Protestant Vakeel. The work, although still only in its infancy, was now beginning to attract some attention, because it provoked the opposition of persons connected with the mosques, and roused the hostility of a party which ultimately effected its overthrow. In 1864 the first Mohammedan actually converted to Christianity was Ishmael Effendi, but neither does he seem to have been known to the Vakeel. This was the year in which the Turkish authorities swooped down on the missionaries, of which action the immediate effect was to stop all evangelistic work, and prevent communication with inquiring Moslems, so that nothing was left for the agents to do but to study the language, and make translations as far as they were able. The fanaticism of the Turks was roused, and for the next year or two it was dangerous even to speak to a Mohammedan on the subject of Christianity. The vigilance of the Government threw impediments in the way of the mission, while the native press was openly hostile. At length a whole Mussulman family was gained over. The father had been baptized in infancy, but had relapsed. The mother and her two daughters were now also baptized. This was in 1869, and in the following year, owing



to difficulties arising from poverty, the wife was persuaded by her friends to return to Mohammedanism, and after veering about several times she finally relapsed. One of her daughters entered a harem, and was afterwards married to a Turkish military officer. The father was taken into the service of the mission as a catechist and Scripture-reader. In 1871 the Society reported that there was in Constantinople a little band of converts, of whom five were communicants, and that there were also a few inquirers, including two Mohammedans from Persia. Both having been denounced to the Persian embassy, because they showed some inclination to become Christians, were arrested as renegades. Through the intervention of Sir Henry Elliot, to whom the missionary appealed on their behalf, they were soon set at liberty, but not before one of them had signed a paper promising to renounce Christianity. The other, after being liberated, was baptized, and subsequently became a catechist in Constantinople. In 1875, during the absence of the missionary in London, he married a Mohammedan woman, and was in consequence dismissed from the service of the mission. Hagop Effendi, for good reasons, pronounced both these converts to be worthless. In 1873 a few Mohammedans, who met together for a religious service in a schoolroom, were obliged to cease their attendance under threat of being dispersed by force. So little progress was made in the mission, that after the Missionary Conference in London, in 1875, the Society determined to concentrate its energies principally in Palestine, while still retaining Constantinople as a station. The stopping of the printing of the Bible by the Turks, and the alleged persecution of converts, showed that it could not be maintained much longer. A year or two after Syra as a missionary station was abandoned, and about the same time a box containing religious tracts was seized at the custom-house at Constantinople by order of the Minister of Instruction, and having been pronounced unfit for circulation in Turkey, the whole of them were destroyed. The native press was again roused to hostility, showing its animus by publishing violent controversial articles against Christianity. About this time the only remaining catechist finally returned to Islamism. In the last days of the mission the Turks do not seem to have taken notice of it, or of a service in a private room, which was attended occasionally by two sons of the woman who had relapsed to Mohammedanism. In 1878, owing, as was said, to difficulties about funds, but in reality from the total failure, the Society withdrew from Constantinople and Smyrna. The report for 1876-77 showed that the aggregate income available for missionary purposes in the former year was £191,000. In 1877-78 it had risen to £210,000, the increase on the previous year being £19,000,

so that the Society would have acted more wisely if it had said that the mission was abandoned because it had entirely collapsed.

The net results were therefore, after twenty-five years' labour, the baptism of four men, one woman, and two of her children. Of the former, two do not seem to have played any important part in the mission; the third was dismissed, and the fourth apostatized. Of the latter, two returned to Islamism, while the reports say nothing about the third. They are confused and inconsistent, but as far as can be made out, these were the actual results.

The Society has directed its attention from the outset, in 1851, when they sent a missionary to Jerusalem, to the native Christians. At a conference held there during that year, at which the late Bishop Bowen (then a missionary in the East), the late Bishop Gobat, and three other foreign agents were present, it was agreed that there was then no room for direct and avowed efforts on behalf of the Moslems, because such would inevitably lead to the suppression of the mission and probably endanger the existence of all Protestant missions in the Turkish empire. They thought that the object of their labours should be what then were called "the fallen Churches," and that present experience showed that it was by efforts through them the Mohammedans would most likely be influenced. They were deeply impressed with the conviction, which has not since been justified, that long-cherished Mohammedan prejudices were giving way, and that scepticism was taking the place of credulity and fanaticism, while Protestant Christianity was obtaining from the Moslems a degree of respect which had never hitherto been shown to the corrupt religious systems of the East. There was a small community of seceders from the native Greek Church at Nazareth which had suffered persecution, and here it was deemed advisable, as there was a nucleus, to establish a missionary, while hopes were entertained that something might be done for the wandering Bedouin by means of the Christian population scattered in the villages. This was the beginning of the Palestine mission, upon lines which can scarcely be said to have been departed from till the present time. One station after another has since been occupied, and by slow degrees a handful of adherents has been gained from the Greek, Latin, and Armenian Churches, and schools have been established, of which the number now appears to be about forty, but no direct efforts have ever been made to convert the Mohammedans, for whose benefit the mission was avowedly intended, as the Society has repeatedly declared in its reports. The agents employed have been nearly all foreigners, owing to the difficulty of inducing properly qualified English clergymen to connect themselves with the work. At present there are only two

employed in the mission, one having recently withdrawn under unpleasant circumstances, and a second, who has since joined another mission at Palestine for reasons which have not been publicly stated.

In the first year of the mission at Nazareth, the missionary, who was a German in English orders, described the Protestants there as consisting of three classes, the first including what he called positive Protestants with real religious life; the second, negative Protestants, who were convinced of the errors of the Latin and Greek Churches without having received into their hearts the positive elements of the Evangelical Church; while the third was composed of political Protestants, who came over to the missionary wishing to be protected from the tyranny and oppression of the native Churches and clergy. This description will suit the adherents who have been collected up to the present time, and will show how ill-fitted they are for producing upon their Mohammedan neighbours any religious impression for good, direct or indirect. In 1853, the missionary returned to England for a short time, leaving the station in charge of a German schoolmaster. During his absence, difficulties and disorders arose among the adherents, which led to the first secession, although the seceders appear afterwards to have returned. This secession was ominous of evil. In the next year, owing to another secession to the Greek Catholic Church, the congregation was reduced to fifty-five persons, the report failing to state how many were children and how many were adults. The missionary, who had in the meantime returned to his post, in 1855, attributed the severe trials to which the congregation was exposed to the "bad behaviour of some of its members," who were not able to make up their minds distinctly either way, because some of them continued to oscillate between the Protestant and Greek Catholic Churches. In the next year he was removed to Jerusalem, leaving his troublesome congregation in the charge of two lay catechists. Two parties, of which each had a leader, had now developed themselves in the congregation, but the reports are silent as to the subjects in dispute. Bishop Gobat, having visited the station, seems to have effected a temporary reconciliation. In the next year another German missionary entered upon the charge of the mission. Describing the state of the congregation, he said that the motives of those who joined it were seldom pure. Intrigues and discontent with the management of the political and ecclesiastical affairs of their own community, and not a desire for a purer faith, were the causes which led many to attach themselves to it, at least outwardly. He deplored the degraded condition of the native Christian women, and the very small success which the mission had achieved among them,

because he knew of only four who attended the services. In 1858, when Dr. Koelle had the station under his temporary charge, an influential member of the congregation, with seventy other persons, withdrew from it, this being the third secession. The reason assigned by the missionary was the refusal of his application for pecuniary assistance to pay off a debt. During the year the number of the congregation fell from 180 to 40. Upon the return of the former missionary to Nazareth, in the following year, he found the number of Protestants greatly reduced, the average attendance at the Sunday services being only about thirty. In 1860 there was a great improvement, and the schoolroom in which they were held became too small for the congregation, religious worship being usually attended by about eighty men. The missionary now turned his attention to the Mohammedans and Druses, but found that the hatred of the former to Christians and Christianity was on the increase, and that direct missionary effort only irritated them and excited their fanaticism, especially when Dr. Pfander's controversial books were put into their hands. In 1862 the congregation was much troubled by apprehensions of evil at their hands. The missionary somewhat incautiously sent a copy of the "*Mizan ul Haqq*," in Turkish, to the Pasha of Acca, who read the book to the Mufti and several of the Ulemas of the place, and asked them to refute the arguments against the Koran contained in it. This at once roused their fanaticism, and, instead of a refutation, the discussion took the form of devising the best means for a summary removal of the missionaries from Nazareth. Attempts were also made to begin work among the Druses, but nothing could be made of them because it was their principle to agree with every religious opinion propounded by the missionary, with the view of concealing their own creed. At one time the whole Druse nation, from political motives, had expressed a desire to become Protestants.

In the report for 1863 the Society urged the need for a church at Nazareth, for which a site had been obtained, but they admitted that their work among the Mohammedans did not enable them to speak of any results. The reason assigned for the little progress in the mission in the following year, was the active opposition by the Turkish authorities to Protestant missions, which it was inconsistently supposed was shown in the long delay in issuing the firman for building the church, even after application had been made for it to the Porte by the British ambassador. Some instances of oppression and violence at Nazareth were attributed to the same cause, and seemed to the Society an evidence that the Turkish authorities were disinclined to grant to the Protestants full toleration and equality of rights

with the other Christian bodies in the Turkish empire, notwithstanding the firman of 1856. The Greeks had also endeavoured to avenge themselves upon the mission by damaging its property, for which no redress could be obtained from the local courts. The cry of persecution was now beginning to be raised by the missionaries. The Governor-General of Syria, Kourshid Pasha, told one of them, and showed by his manner, that he hated them for attempting to convert the Moslems, and the Pasha of Acca and his subordinates were not slow in imitating his example. A strong hostile feeling was in consequence raised among Latins, Greeks, and fanatical Mohammedans, which resulted in an attack upon the mission-school by the Catholics, led by their priest, who was a Franciscan monk, and in the seizure of some of the ground belonging to it. At one of the out-stations, Seraphim Boutagi, a native catechist, had been beaten and wounded, and other Protestants had been injured. The firman for building the church had, however, been obtained, but the work could not be commenced owing, as was again inconsistently said, to the Turks, the cholera, and the want of funds. The native congregation was given as 129, including men, women and children. In 1866, the missionary said that both adults and children were eager for education, and that among the scholars in the schools were a few Moslems and Druses. The Turks continued to oppose direct efforts to convert the Mohammedans, so that as far as they were concerned no results could be announced, but the number of native Christian adherents continued to increase. In 1867 two noteworthy events occurred in the Palestine mission, one being the laying the foundation-stone of the church at Nazareth, and the other the appointment of the first English missionary. This gentleman soon withdrew, for he came back to England in the following year and did not return. The report for 1869 was encouraging, there being upwards of 500 native Christians connected with the Nazareth mission. It was stated that direct work among the Moslems did not seem to be practicable, and that no one had been baptized. In the next year the missionary, encouraging himself, said that the process of the disintegration of Mohammedanism was going on, perhaps not so quickly as might be wished, but still that it was proceeding. He and his colleagues thought that they were pushing it forward, but Islamism continues to this day as compact as ever. In 1873 a second English clergyman was appointed to the mission. After labouring at various stations, and finally among the Druses of the Hauran, whose case he pronounced to be hopeless, because their sheiks refused to listen to him, at the end of ten years he finally withdrew. In 1875 there were reported to be 600 native Christian adherents at Nazareth.

The unsatisfactory state of their missions to the Mohammedans in the Turkish empire and in India, induced the committee to summon their agents to a conference in Salisbury Square, in October, 1875, with the view of promoting an expression of opinion as to their prospects. No report of the proceedings of this conference was ever published, because the effect on the subscribers to the funds could not have been other than discouraging. The tone of the different speakers was desponding, and augured badly for success in the future, while all were agreed that the hereditary pride, intolerance and traditions of a dominant race, especially in the East, were formidable barriers to missionary enterprise. They were not agreed as to the best place of operation, or as to the lesser causes which had hitherto rendered them fruitless. Some thought that as the Levant was the headquarters of Islamism, the efforts of the Society should be concentrated mainly upon the Turks. Others were of opinion that a great impediment in the way of converting them was one of the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith, which no Mohammedan could be induced to accept, because he believed it to be inconsistent with the unity of God. This difficulty, however, was regarded as only secondary when compared with the social and political obstructions. The Turk who accepted Christianity was looked upon by his friends as a traitor and an apostate, and as religious liberty, although existing in theory, was a dead-letter in the Ottoman dominions, it could scarcely be expected that many would face the consequences of conversion. One gentleman held that there was toleration for infidels and idolaters, but none for the Turk himself, meaning by the former the Fellahin, Ansairiyeh, and Yezidis, or devil-worshippers, who live among the Nestorians on the Tigris. Another held that the chief cause of failure was the hostility of the Ottoman Government, and that no results could be expected in countries under Mohammedan rule, where preaching and the circulation of controversial books were practically impossible. The interference of England in the affairs of Turkey when, in conjunction with France at the time of the Crimean war, she prevented the empire from being broken up, was, in the opinion of another missionary, an indirect cause of the failure of missions. She had saved the Turks from ruin, and as Mohammedanism was the State religion, it necessarily followed that it had received a corresponding accession of strength and stability. Another believed that when the Turks were driven across the Bosphorus, and forced back to the steppes of Asia from which they had descended as conquerors centuries before, it would be found that a great work which was even then beginning in the Mohammedan mind would develop itself. Some thought that a very formidable

obstruction in the way of these missions was the superstitions and the depressed condition of the Eastern Churches, and that there was no hope of reaching the Turks so long as the missionaries were face to face with the Greek and Latin religious systems, which were looked upon by them as idolatrous. From this the only possible inference is, that so long as the orthodox Greek, the Papal Greek, and the Latin Churches continue to exist, missions to the Mohammedans, in the opinion of this gentleman, are hopeless. Another hit the point with more effect, when he said that the causes of failure were want of zeal, and the difficulty in securing the services of suitable agents, both English and native.

There was a wide difference of opinion as to the best mode of dealing with the Mohammedans. No one seems to have advocated direct efforts, thereby ignoring and forgetting Church history. Some thought that a native Church gathered from the Armenians, Greeks and Latins, purified from superstition, idolatry and traditionalism, would be the best possible indirect agency. Others thought that efforts ought to be made to raise the religious tone of the Oriental Churches, and that the work of missions should be carried on in conjunction with them. All were agreed that the indications of favourable results were few, and that if the day for the conversion of the Mohammedans was near, it was a very cloudy day. While searching for causes to account for their failure, the conference neglected to look in a quarter where it would have had no difficulty in finding them. The Mohammedan missionary problem is undoubtedly a difficult one, and the solution of it will never be accomplished by resorting to indirect means in defiance of apostolic example and history. The experience of the last thirty-three years shows that those who have obtained the management of these missions are unable to grapple with it, and that this is the real cause of the failure.

In 1876 the Society reported that a third English clergyman had been found to undertake charge of a station in the Palestine mission, with which he is still connected. During this and the following year the congregation at Nazareth continued to be troublesome and unsettled. In the *Church Missionary Intelligencer* for October, 1877, it was reported by the committee that it had long been in an unsatisfactory state. Worldliness and party spirit had marked their conduct, and had caused much grief to those who laboured among them. An English clergyman who was then in charge of the station, pronounced Boutagi to be the best of the native agents. The reduction of the number of communicants from seventy to forty was attributed to the molestation of the members of the Greek Church and to the Jesuits. The missionary reported that the effects of the insur-

rection in Herzegovina had been felt in Palestine in the increased bitterness of the Moslem population toward the mission. In this year a German catechist, who had been ordained a deacon by Bishop Gobat, was appointed to take charge of the station, with Boutagi (who was now in priest's orders) for his assistant, thereby reversing the natural order of things. The report for 1877 contains a complaint that while the younger members of the congregation who had been educated in the schools were easily managed, the older, instead of endeavouring to learn more of religion, were busying themselves in striving to do away with all Church government. It was said that the influence of Boutagi for good was powerful, and that he was endeavouring to effect some improvement among them. A few Mohammedans occasionally showed themselves at the services, but none of them were converted, and there were a few Moslem children in the schools. In 1879 the Greek Bishop opened a superior school at Nazareth, which drew away from the missionaries 300 scholars, leaving them only 100. The Latins were also active in extending their operations. In the *Church Missionary Intelligencer* for August of the same year, it was said that the number of adherents there and at the out-stations was 436, of whom fifty were communicants. The religious state of the congregation was again pronounced to be unsatisfactory. Boutagi was discouraged at being appointed to labour among such troublesome people, but his efforts to promote peace were so far successful that a few really good men who had been temporarily perverted into Plymouth Brethrenism were induced to return. He soon received his reward for healing this breach by being accused of the very errors against which he was contending.

In the report for 1880-81 the state of things at Nazareth was said to be still unsatisfactory, the missionary describing the year as a sifting time. A fourth secession had taken place, some former adherents having withdrawn through disappointment at not obtaining the temporary relief which they had erroneously expected. The native Christians remaining were said to be in the aggregate 420, including men, women and children. The missionary accounted for the defection by saying that the Greek and Latin Churches seemed to be deliberately buying over the Christians of the country.

In 1881 the Society sent a member of their committee to Palestine to inspect their stations and report upon the state of their mission. The opinions of this gentleman, who did not understand and could not speak Arabic, were embodied in a document which was published in the report for the same year. In their prefatory observations they made the surprising statement that he had produced evidence of the Society's success in



spreading a knowledge of the Christian religion among the Mohammedans to an extent not hitherto suspected by the committee themselves, the truth being that except the presence of a few Moslem children in the schools, no impression whatever had been made, and no one having been converted by their agents. The attitude of the Mohammedans during the whole period of the mission seems rather to have been that of good-natured contempt than active opposition, for the missionaries never sustained any injury at their hands. In the report for 1879 the committee had actually said, "As far as the Mohammedans are concerned, in a country where, under Turkish rule, the baptism of one of them would almost certainly be followed by his death, the most useful agencies are those which quietly prepare the way for more aggressive work, for which the time cannot now be far off. These are schools and the printing-press." The supposed danger is contradicted by the testimony of the Vakeel and of the consul at Jerusalem, by the declaration of the Sultan himself to Sir Henry Layard, and of the Turkish Ministers, and unwittingly by a writer in the *Times* of October 6 last, who was endeavouring to defend the Society, although being only an English tourist he knew nothing about the mission except what was told him by its agents. The dissensions which prevailed at Nazareth were represented as being fomented by Boutagi, and a prosecution before Bishop Barclay was determined on. The avowed accusation was bad temper and insubordination to the foreign missionaries, and it was suggested that he held doctrines contrary to those of the Church of England—the insinuation being that he was a Plymouth Brother. When inquiry was made by the Bishop, it was ascertained that one of his books, which neither their inspector nor the committee could read, had been written to disprove the errors of the sect. The action of the Bishop in liberating Boutagi from an unjust accusation told with ruinous effect upon the person who had recommended the prosecution and the committee in London which carried it out. The effect of the persecution of Boutagi was a fifth secession, which reduced the congregation from 450 to 70 adults. It can scarcely be said that these disorders were likely to increase the moral power of the native Christian adherents of the Society in impressing the Moslem population.

The report for 1881 stated that the congregation at Nazareth numbered 380 souls in the aggregate, which can with some difficulty be reconciled with the paper published in the *Church Missionary Intelligencer* for September of the same year, where it was said that it was reduced to seventy adults. The Society has a mission station at Gaza, to which their inspector referred in glowing terms. Speaking of the schools, he said,

“Owing to the fanatical feeling of the place it is impossible to educate Moslems and Christians together, as the boys of one religion dare not go into the quarter of the others.” This seems to show, if any credence is to be attached to it, that the conversion of the Mohammedans through the indirect agency of the native Christians is hopeless. The report for 1882 said that the congregation of Nazareth was of a very mixed character, and caused much sorrow and anxiety. Owing to the public criticism of the Palestine mission, the Society began their report for the next year by saying that missions to the Mohammedans have always presented exceptional difficulties, and that “harvest-time in Egypt, Palestine, and Syria is not yet.” They complained that their mission was exposed to a revival of Mohammedan fanaticism at the instance of the Government, owing to recent political events in Egypt; that attention having been directed to their schools, orders had been given that for the future none should be opened without special permission; and that no Mohammedan children could be allowed to attend Christian schools. The report concluded with the melancholy admission that, so far as human eyes can see, large results of mission work in any part of the Turkish empire are not, under present circumstances, to be looked for. The only noteworthy matter in the report about Nazareth was that several of the schools, having been considered unsatisfactory, had been closed.

The mission at stations in other parts of Palestine, as at Nazareth, ought to be described as a mission to the native Christians, and not to the Mohammedans and Fellahin, as it is called in the reports, because, whatever be the intention and objects of the committee in London, there have been hitherto no results in the conversion of any of the adherents of Islamism, although there may have been less confusion and fewer secessions from native congregations. The mission to the Druses of the Hauran has also been an utter failure, because the sheiks in their guest-houses absolutely refused to listen to what the missionaries had to say, although they were anxious for the education of their children and were willing to defray some portion of the expense. The wandering Bedouin were entirely beyond the ability of the Society's agents to reach by any means, direct or indirect, while the inviting field of the Ansairiyeh was utterly neglected.

None of the items of the sums expended on the Palestine mission in each of the thirty-three years during which it has been in existence has been furnished in the annual financial statements, the Society contenting itself with giving the lump sum, so that criticism of the different objects on which the money has been expended is difficult. However, in the spring of 1861 they sent a member of their committee to inspect their stations,

in which year the cost of the mission was set down as £9,724, which was an increase of £1,615 upon the previous year. In 1882 the expenditure fell to £7,318, being a decrease of £2,408, so that the only possible conclusion is that the mission of this gentleman was a costly one. The difficulty is further increased because, while in the former year the number of agents employed in the mission was 65, in the latter, notwithstanding the decreased expenditure, it had risen to 82. In 1882, a member of the London committee visited the mission stations in Palestine. According to the report for that year, the number of agents was 84, and the expenditure £7,316. In the next year the former were 80, while the expenditure was £8,476, showing an increase of £1,160. Is there any connection between this increase and the mission to the East of an inspector who could not speak any native language? By adding up the sums expended in each year, it appears that in the aggregate more than £120,000 has already been thrown away on this unfortunate mission.

The results achieved are threefold. No adult Mohammedan has yet been converted and baptized by the agents of the Society. In the report for 1882 they said that they had baptized two boys, of whom one was a Mohammedan by birth, who had been supported in the Society's boarding-school from infancy, and the other was a Druse from the Lebanon, about whom no particulars were furnished. The Druses are not Mohammedans. In that for the next year, one of their missionaries reported that he had baptized an adult woman and her daughter in the Society's mission church in Jerusalem. He said that this was the first baptism of an adult Mohammedan, and in fact of any Moslem which had ever taken place there. The woman was a servant at the Prussian Deaconesses Institution, of which her daughter was an inmate, where she had received some instruction in the Christian faith; so that, although baptized by an agent of the Church Missionary Society at her own request, the Society cannot claim her as a convert. The woman declared that she had no fear of persecution, her case contradicting the declaration of the Society in 1880, that no Mohammedan could be baptized without running the risk of losing his life.

The number of persons who in the last and previous reports are called native Christian adherents is 1,959, including men, women and children. They have been supposed to be converts from Mohammedanism, and much mischief has been caused by what is an ambiguous and misleading description. If the males have been registered according to Turkish law, the Vakeel's list at Constantinople will show the exact number of converts from the native Christian Churches, and if they have not been

registered the Society has only succeeded in placing their adherents in the difficult position of outlaws. Those benevolent persons who, with some degree of credulity, subscribe money to maintain this mission, can scarcely be aware of this alternative. In the report for 1873 the Society said, in the "Summary" of the Palestine mission, that the returns were incomplete, the native Christian adherents being set down as 565 in the aggregate. In a note appended to the statistics of the mission in the report for 1874 it was said that they were "only approximate," the number of adherents in that year being 750, of whom 600 were at Nazareth and Salt. It also contained the surprising statement that, at the close of the Crimean war in 1856, the prestige which attached to the English name had led many native Christians in Palestine to attach themselves to the Protestant missions at Nazareth and elsewhere. Subsequently not a few of them either returned to their former faith, or practically gave up connection with the missionaries. Striking off these persons, the actual number of adherents at Nazareth and the out-stations would, as the committee said, not exceed 300, with perhaps thirty or forty communicants. This admission seems to show that they did not know how many real and how many nominal converts belonged to their mission. According to the report for 1875, the native Christians had increased to 1,050, of whom 600 were said to be at Nazareth, but there was no mention of approximate returns. In 1876 the number there had decreased to 300, while the aggregate in Palestine was said to be 1,040, the returns being "approximate." In subsequent years the general aggregate continues to increase, while the numbers at Nazareth fluctuate considerably. Whatever success may have attended the efforts of the missionaries to gain over the native Christian men, they seem almost entirely to have failed among the native women. In an official document published by the Society in the *Ecclesiastical Gazette* for December, 1883, it was said that one of their German agents in Palestine, when before the committee in Salisbury Square, had stated that "the mission there had no great *visible* results to record as regarded the numbers brought under instruction, and that their schools and congregations were comparatively small."

The efforts of the Society have been principally concentrated in schools for the young, in which native Christian and a few Mohammedan children have hitherto been collected together. The reports furnish very little information about them, except that the principal part of the teaching is instruction in the doctrines of the Christian religion, to the almost total neglect of secular subjects. The statistics of the numbers, which show a considerable increase in each year, are not reliable. In 1879 there were

said to be 979 children in the schools, according to the statements given in the text of the report, but in the "Summary of the Palestine Mission," which follows immediately after, the number is 1,142. In 1880 there were thirty-one schools, and the number of children was 1,762, the returns being said to be "approximate." This is the statement in the "Summary," but from the body of the report it is impossible to make out more than 848. The returns for 1881 are equally remarkable. In one of the introductory sentences to the report, 1,500 is given as the number of scholars in the Society's schools in Palestine. By adding up the figures given subsequently, it is impossible to make out more than 675, while in the "Summary," which immediately follows, the aggregate is 1,635. Warned by the criticisms to which these returns have been subjected, the Society took up different ground in the report for 1882, because no definite information was given beyond extracts from the letters of the English inspector who visited the Palestine mission in that year. The numbers of the children in different schools were not given, so that it afforded no means of verifying the "Summary," which gave the scholars in attendance as 1,947. In 1883 the numbers are set down in the "Summary" as 1,960. The supporters of the Society are not informed whether the figures represent the names on the books, or the highest attendance, or the average. The unsatisfactory character of these returns will appear from a few extracts from the reports for the last four years from two stations. In that for 1880 the number of children in attendance at Jaffa was stated to be from 300 to 400. The missionary at Gaza said that in "the Greek schools" forty-eight girls and forty-two boys were in attendance, besides forty-five Moslem girls in a separate school, and a number of Moslem boys, which varied from forty to five. The report for 1881 does not give the numbers in attendance at either station. In 1882 the statement about the mission at Jaffa was that the services and schools were well attended during the early part of the year, but that both "fell off terribly during the summer," no numbers being given. At Gaza, in that year, the English inspector found in the four schools 137 children present, of whom he was told that sixty-three were Moslems. In the report for 1883 it was said that in the day-school at Jaffa there were sixty-three boys, there being no mention of girls, and that forty young men were in a night-school. At Gaza, the schools for Christian boys and girls and for Mohammedan girls were said to be successful. The attendance of Mohammedan boys was very irregular, "more than 200 had attended during the year, but sometimes only twenty or thirty were present at one time." By taking the larger number, it is easy to see how the aggregate statistics can be increased.

The Society has also in Jerusalem a training-school for school-masters and catechists, which in 1880 had eleven pupils. In that year it was not in a satisfactory condition. In the report for the next year it is referred to as "an important agency," all notice of the withdrawal from the mission in disgust of the clergyman who had been appointed to manage it, as stated in that for the previous year, having been suppressed. In those for 1882 and 1883 no mention is made of it, from which the only possible conclusion is that it was not doing any useful work.

Subsidiary to this is an orphanage, erroneously called in the report for 1881 "the only higher Protestant school in Palestine," which was regarded as "practically the junior training institution for the mission." It was founded by the late Bishop Gobat for the support and education of destitute Christian and Mohammedan children, and was maintained by funds collected in Germany and England. The training institution was principally recruited from boys who had received in it their elementary education. Owing to advanced years and the difficulty of collecting funds for its maintenance, the Bishop handed it over with the responsibility attaching to it to the Church Missionary Society, who made one of their missionaries superintendent and manager. In the *Intelligencer* for August, 1879, it was called a boarding-school, which had then sixty-six pupils, of whom eight were Moslems, twenty-nine Protestants, twenty-five Greeks, two Kopts, and two Latins, with one European and two native masters. Exclusive of teachers' salaries, the cost was said to be £750 per annum, or about £12 per head. According to the report for 1881, there were in it in that year sixty boarders, who were *mainly* supported by funds raised by the superintendent, of which £84 came from England, £16 from America, and £462 from Germany, no information being furnished about the source from whence the balance of £154 came. In the report for 1882 the committee of the Society said that they had felt it right to make a grant to it for one year, although "the maintenance of a boarding-school for children and orphans was not as a rule regarded as a proper object for the general fund." The attempt of the Society to wrest from the late Bishop Barclay the balance of the Gobat diocesan fund, with the view of applying it to the support of this institution for paupers, has been told by his biographer, and is a curious illustration of the way in which missions are managed by a London committee.

Besides these organizations, the Society has in Jerusalem a printing-press, from which they have issued tracts in Arabic, and some small religious books, the aggregate result being scarcely worth mentioning in comparison with the labours of the Jesuits and American missionaries in the dissemination of religious and secular literature in the East.

The complete and admitted failure of the Church Missionary Society to convert the Mohammedans in Palestine, as they failed in Constantinople, has contributed to ruin the Jerusalem bishopric. Their mission to the Oriental Christians, in the hope of raising up an indirect agency for reaching them, has equally failed, and has besides not only produced a schism from the native Churches, but also by the dissensions and secessions to which it has given rise, has brought discredit upon the English Church in the East. This policy of preying upon them, that they may have something to show as compensation for their failure to convert the followers of the Prophet, was disavowed by the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1842. In an official letter to the Oriental patriarchs and bishops at the time of the foundation of the bishopric, he said that it was not intended that the new Bishop should interfere with them in any way, further than to aid them with counsel and sympathy in promoting the best interests of their people, nothing being further from the object of the See than to proselytize them. It is a matter of surprise that the subscribers to the funds of the Society have never turned their attention to the present state of things, which would probably never have been known if the appointment of the late Dr. Barclay to the bishopric of Jerusalem had not caused it to be investigated by his friends. There is an agitation now going on for a public inquiry into the management of Church missions in the East, which we think ought no longer to be delayed. The reports of the Church Missionary Society itself prove that their mission to the Mohammedans in Palestine is an imposture.

---

## CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

## THEOLOGY.

**A**N adequate notice of the outcome of so much preparation as the Revised Old Testament,<sup>1</sup> somewhat unequally (and inequitably) yoked with the Revised New Testament, to which it is very far superior, would demand far more time and space than can here be given; we must content ourselves with a few desultory remarks. We agree with the Revisers that they were not called upon to reconstitute the Masoretic text; indeed, any attempt in that direction would let in those—like De Wette or Professor Wellhausen—who would decompose it into several originals and many interpolations. Now, this is at least premature. But they were called upon to re-translate the text effectively, and make it more intelligible to the average reader. This, so far as we can see, they have done very well. We note with regret the departure of certain archaisms: the millstone no longer “all to brake” (Zurich) Abimelech’s skull (Judg. ix. 57); nor does the scapegoat remain under that title; “Hell” (= Hades) is replaced by the meaningless “Sheol;” and why should the “cockatrice” give way to the less picturesque synonym “basilisk”? But the demands of the American Revisers make us thankful to have escaped so cheaply. The amateur grammarian has always been more prominent in America than with us—though, happily, the American dialects constitute a healthy protest against him—and his disregard of antiquity and want of historical sense in language make themselves felt in many of the American Revisers’ suggestions. Materially the version is less changed than we should have expected, and the changes are mostly for the better. The mules have disappeared from Genesis (xxxvi. 24); the specialities of Jubal and Tubal Cain are slightly altered; no longer are those “who have lain among the pots” miraculously whitened (Ps. lxxviii. 13), nor do the daughters of Jerusalem “sew pillows to armholes” (Ezek. xiii. 18); “dragons” and “sea monsters” give place to jackals (Jer. x. 22, Lam. iv. 13), and “the company of spear-men” to the “wild beast of the reeds” (Ps. lxxviii. 30); the “Nazirite” makes it clear that Samson has nothing to do with Nazareth; “meat offerings” are replaced by “meal offerings;” “the Ashtaroth” is clearly not “she whom the Phœnicians called Astarte,” but a plural, as is “the Baalim” (Judg. iii. 1); the “sacred groves” become “the Asheroth,” and so perishes some ingenious amateur theorizing on tree worship in Israel. The greatest gain is, we think, in the poetical and prophetical books. The printing as poetry, not only of the former, but of Lamech’s lament, Noah’s curse, the prophecies of Isaac and

<sup>1</sup> “The Holy Bible: being the Version set forth A.D. 1611, Compared with the Most Ancient Authorities, and Revised.” Printed for the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. 1885.



Jacob, the extracts from the Book of Jasher, and the like, is an immense gain. "Selah" is clearly a musical direction, and "Shigionoth" (Hab. iii. 1), "Shiggaion," &c., are clearly systems of music. The *refrain* in the Song of Solomon is shown to be so, and improved in expression (ii. 7, &c.). The minor prophets and Isaiah, especially the former, are at last intelligible to the English reader. The "wild bull in a net" (Isa. li. 20) (how long would a wild bull remain in a net?) becomes an antelope; the children of Israel who are dragged from their beds are no longer *hiding* there, but reclining luxuriously (Amos iii. 12). In Nahum ii. 5, the introduction of the word "mantelet" at once gives a picture of attack on a walled town; and "cormorant and bittern" are far less effective features in the picture of a desolated city than the Revisers' "pelican and porcupine" (Zeph. ii. 14). Yet there is less change than we should have expected. The well-known lesson for Christmas Day is made much clearer, and the well-known supposed prophecy of the Redeemer (Job xix. 25 *seq.*) receives the usual interpretation, the "worms," however, disappearing; but the speech of Elihu is not even bracketed. Rachel indeed retains her "teraphim" (Gen. xxxii. 34), but Solomon is in a palanquin (Song of Songs iii. 9), and Rebekah has a nose-ring. In short, the changes seem to us to be nearly all in the direction of vividness and truth. The printing is good, though the sudden spacing here and there shows haste; but no eyes could long endure the strain of the cheapest edition, and 7s. 6d. is a good deal for the great bulk of Bible readers. It is much to be regretted that the people's book in its best form should be thus kept back from them. Even the financial needs of the universities cannot justify their procedure.

Professor Wellhausen's great work<sup>2</sup>—the translation of which, though here and there rather rough, is at least up to the average—marks, we suppose, the outside limit of the reconstructive school of the Old Testament critics. It may briefly be described as the evidence for his article in the "Encyclopædia Britannica," which is here reprinted with some additions. He aims at the complete inversion of the received sources of the history. Leviticus is composed long after the Captivity, when the Jews' interest in their history is purely ecclesiastical; it exaggerates the position and importance of the priesthood, and gives laws for an ideal land which it maps out regardless of geographic or economic limitations (p. 159). The Books of Chronicles, which are marked by an exaggerated sacerdotalism, belong to the same period; while Deuteronomy, the product of an age of conflict, dates from just before or during the Captivity, and insists on the necessity of a return to the Law of Moses—a law, however, which is ideal (cp. *e.g.* p. 32). Judges, Samuel, and Kings, though containing much old material, have undergone a Deuteronomic sacerdotal revision (pp. 247, 272). This inversion takes place in accordance with his

<sup>2</sup> "Prolegomena to the History of Israel." By Julius Wellhausen, Professor of Oriental Languages in the University of Marburg. Translated by A. Sutherland Black, M.A., and Allan Menzies, B.D. With an Introduction by Professor Robertson Smith. Edinburgh: Adam & Charles Black. 1885.

reconstruction of the history and institutions. The Passover was originally in part a pastoral feast, in part the feast of the commencement of the harvest; the unleavened bread is bread made of the first fruits and baked without waiting for leaven; the Feast of Weeks marks the completion of the harvest (p. 83 *seq.*), the Feast of Tabernacles the vintage. The Levites were scattered, together with the tribe of Simeon, by some special disaster brought on by their own folly and shadowed forth in the last words of Jacob, and the remnant were drawn into the priesthood as the sole means of livelihood (p. 145). The Aaronic priesthood dated simply from Zadok, who in Solomon's reign ousted the house of Eli. In Judges there is no proper priesthood (p. 128). The tabernacle is the shadow of Solomon's temple, projected backwards (pp. 37-42), and the priests in the Blessing of Moses are a guild, not a tribe (p. 135). Monarchy arose by the aid of the priests, and its tendency is to concentrate them and to centralize the worship in Jerusalem. But in Israel it fails to do so; it is only in the mountainous and comparatively unimportant Judæa that religion becomes the predominant interest; and the abolition of the high places is not attempted by Solomon and not urged even by Isaiah (xxx. 22) (p. 25). Exod. xx. 24-26 admits a plurality of altars, and the earlier history makes much of the alleged special sanctuaries of the patriarchs, but Leviticus assumes that worship is centralized (cp. Lev. xvii.) (cp. pp. 34, 35). Sacrifice, like the feasts, "begins as naïve and becomes legal." At first a joyous feast with God, it becomes an offering to Him; with the centralization of worship, the notion of feasting disappears, and a sacrifice is valid if only the priest is present at it (pp. 70-86). Along with the change grows up the notion of expiation (p. 75). On the value of such a book, from any point of view, we need hardly insist. If negative criticism has no other value, it at least stimulates interest and faith. But, as this is meant to be a popular book, it may be worth while to point out to the lay reader that its conclusions are by no means final. In historical criticism, as elsewhere, hypotheses are not true merely because they explain most of the facts; they require the support of independent evidence. And in this kind of reconstruction the earlier efforts are more extreme than the later. Now, Prof. Wellhausen's explanations have a plausible look; but they have to be supported by the liberal assumption of interpolations in Judges, Samuel, and Kings, and they are products of that subjective criticism which has had its day—say, rather, its century—in Greek and Roman history and literature, and has not greatly shaken the substantial accuracy of the record. The most extreme speculations of reconstructive critics, as of philosophers, return at last to common opinion. As to theology, Prof. Wellhausen steers a middle course—not always the safest—between the extremes of negation and orthodoxy. The Hebrew creed is a development indeed, but a development of an original monotheism, and all attempts to discover a basis for it in polytheism, or Nature-worship or fire-worship, are absurd. For so much at least the conservative theologian may thank him; but his work, if it had no other merits, would at least be

suggestive and stimulating. The general reader, however, is apt either to recoil from these works in horror or to treat them as reasoned truth ; and either course is undesirable.

Prof. Robertson Smith introduces Prof. Wellhausen's work as the latest utterance of the evolution school of theology. Whatever the wisest way to meet that school may be, it is clearly not Canon Pearson's way.<sup>3</sup> To republish (with an Introduction and notes condemnatory rather than critical) a work written before the development theory had reached England, and written in a style which makes it seem even more antiquated than it is, is a tactical mistake which we should have thought impossible. His notes display wide reading and accurate knowledge ; but his chivalrous contempt of all modern methods and munitions of war prevents him from really entering the battle ; and the book he republishes, valuable as it may be incidentally in its treatment of Christian dogma, is of no more use as a weapon now than a catapult or a war-chariot. For, if the book is not presented to meet the development theory (p. xii.), it is hard to see what many of the notes are for—nor what purpose is served by showing that Christ is not liable to the imputation of fraud, and the Gospel history not a legend about a non-existent person, when no serious controversialist would now assert either. The "*Propædeia Prophetica*" is a work of great learning, especially for its own day, but its republication as a mere re-assertion of a former scheme of the harmonizing of Scripture cannot but be interpreted as a defiance, and this interpretation, confirmed by the Dean Burgon-like character of the editorial notes, can do nothing but harm to the cause that Canon Pearson has most at heart.

In the history of the Hebrews, as in other history, the Euhemerists and the Solar Mythologists have had their fling, and have been frequently corrected by the discovery of inscriptions. This great work<sup>4</sup> may be described as corrective of Prof. Wellhausen. Written ten years ago, the German original now appears in a second edition double its former size. It has at last been translated (and very well, too), and furnished with an excellent introduction. The book takes the form of a commentary, a kind of collation of various passages in the Old Testament with the inscriptions bearing upon them. We note as of special interest the Chaldean story of Creation and the Deluge, the treatment of the names of peoples in Genesis x., and some of the confirmations of the Books of Kings and Chronicles—notably 2 Kings x. 32 as to the captivity of Manasseh, 2 Chron. xxxiii. 11–13, and Nahum iii. 8–11. In short, Prof. Schrader's work serves as a corrective to the eccentric theories of Wellhausen and others, notably another of the authors on our list.

<sup>3</sup> "*Propædeia Prophetica*." By William Rowe Lyall, D.D., sometime Dean of Canterbury. New Edition, with Notes, by G. C. Pearson, M.A., Ch.Ch., Hon. Canon of Canterbury. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1885.

<sup>4</sup> "The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament." By Professor Eberhard Schrader, D.D., Ph.D. Translated, with Preface, by Rev. Owen C. Whitehouse. Vol. I. London: Williams & Norgate. 1885.

M. Weill<sup>5</sup> holds that Ezra grafted upon the Mosaic Law the idea of the miraculous; and, this once admitted, Christianity is unavoidable. He proposes, therefore, to purge Judaism of the miraculous, and so prepare for a revival of the unparalleled legislation and religion of Moses, the only refuge in the impending conflict between Theism and Atheism, and the only faith possible for the now faithless Jews. As the work has only reached Genesis vi., we cannot yet give any account of the religion of Moses and M. Weill. But the old-fashioned treatment of the genealogies in Genesis does not promise well for the scientific character of the rest of the work.

Herr Engel<sup>6</sup> is also a Euhemerist; but, unlike other Euhemerists, he succeeds in producing an interesting book. The corner-stone of Hebrew history is, according to him, the description of the Garden of Eden in Gen. ii. 10-14. An exhaustive examination of this description enables us to recognize in it the oasis of Rûhbe—the natural centre of the whole district between the mountains of Hauran and the Dahr el Berrie. This was the original habitation of the ancestors of the Hebrews; the tradition of its locality was obscured by the loss of the land eastward of Jordan, and more especially by the Captivity, but transformed into the Garden of Eden by the popular fancy; and the sharp division of the oasis of Rûhbe from the waterless and burning plateau of es-Safâ by a wall of lava suggests the distinction between Paradise and hell (pp. 191, 192). If his ultimate result, as with the Euhemerists of Plato's day, seems a product of a "crude sort of philosophy," and *Urahen* and *Urzeit* have gone the way of the Aryan patriarch and his daughter the milkmaid, we may at least congratulate him on the excellence of his execution and the fulness of the evidence, which marks the accomplished Orientalist.

The wilder conjectures of German reconstructionists, in theology or elsewhere, offer an easy opportunity of attack to the conservative critic; and of this Herr König<sup>7</sup> has availed himself, carrying out his attack with a plentiful display of Hebrew scholarship and theological learning. We think, however, he dwells overmuch on points of detail; and we are not sure that an attack on the propounders of hypotheses which have failed to explain the facts is quite legitimate in theology; it certainly would not be in any other branch of learning. Still, the book is of some value as a warning against the acceptance of hasty generalization, and is worth noticing as a sign of the "Conservative reaction" in German theology spoken of in the last number of this Review.

<sup>5</sup> "Le Pentateuque selon Moïse et le Pentateuque selon Esra." Par Alexandre Weill. 1<sup>re</sup> Partie. Paris: Dentu. 1885.

<sup>6</sup> "Die Lösung der Paradiesfrage." Von Moritz Engel. Leipzig: Otto Schulze. 1885.

<sup>7</sup> "Die Hauptprobleme der alt-Israelitischen Religionsgeschichte gegenüber den Entwicklungstheoretikern beleuchtet." Von Lic. Dr. F. E. König. Leipzig: Hinrichs. 1884.

To Dr. Pfeiderer<sup>8</sup> Paul is the champion of spirit against Jewish ritual, of inward revelation against external ordinance; in short, the first Protestant. Far from being the true founder of Christianity, as Hartmann and others [notably Comte] have suggested, he but developed and formulated the teaching of "Jesus his Lord and ours," whose spirit he sought to apprehend through the conceptions of his age (pp. 14, 15). Christianity dates from Christ; Christian theology from St. Paul. The first step, indeed, towards the universalizing of religion was taken by Stephen the Hellenist, to whom the ethical and spiritual truths of the law were far more than its ritual observance (p. 29). His influence brought over St. Paul, who breaks up and expands the Christianity of the early Church. To that Church Jesus was Messiah in spite of his crucifixion; to St. Paul, because of it. The constant thought of it, combined with the physical conditions of his journey to Damascus, produced in him a subjective vision which altered his whole life. Subjective or objective, however, it was equally "of God" (p. 43), though the three extant accounts are wholly irreconcilable (p. 34). Thereupon he worked out the spirit of Christ, as he conceived it, into a scheme of theology, scholastic because of his training, yet the expression of deep spiritual life (p. 48). It comes by direct revelation. "Christ after the flesh," the historical Christ, is to Paul relatively unimportant (p. 134). His central doctrine, that of substitution, starts from the Pharisaic notion of atonement as expiation, but transforms it (p. 60 *seq.*). Christ not merely stood for man, but man, by Christ's entrance into him, becomes one with him, and thereby pleasing to God (p. 67). Paul's theology oscillates between the antithetic views of God as a Judge and a Father, but (as far as we understand Dr. Pfeiderer) it practically reconciles the antithesis (pp. 67, 68). Accordingly, it is Paul who invests Baptism and the Lord's Supper, originally mere external rites, with a spiritual significance (p. 85), and who creates a spiritual Christianity in conflict with the legal and tribal Christianity of the stricter Jewish Christians. The conflict is manifest at the first Apostolic Council. Paul's share in it is marked, first, by Galatians, the full expression of his views; next, by the two Epistles to the Corinthians, protest against those who had undermined his authority; next, by Romans, in which he brings his own doctrine more into conformity with historical Judaism. But the conflict goes on throughout the first centuries; the Apocalypse, repudiating Paul himself (for his name has no place among those of the twelve Apostles) (p. 156), yet combines his doctrine with traditional Judaism (p. 158). The Epistle of James is anti-Paulinist, St. Mark's Gospel Paulinist, St. Matthew's Gospel a Judaist reply, and the condemnation of "him that shall break one of these least commandments" is meant for St. Paul (p. 178). St. Luke's Gospel is one of compromise; the mission of the Seventy and the story of Martha

<sup>8</sup> "The Influence of the Apostle Paul on the Development of Christianity." By Otto Pfeiderer, D.D., Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin. Translated by J. Frederick Smith. (Hibbert Lectures, 1885.) London: Williams & Norgate.

and Mary have a Paulinist bearing (!) (p. 193). The exaltation of spirit over ritual is carried on, first, by the Epistle to the Hebrews (by an Alexandrian Paulinist of the time of Domitian), then by the Epistle to Barnabas and the "Deutero-Pauline Epistles," Ephesians and Colossians; and it culminates in the Gnosticism of Marcion. The Clementine Constitutions are a ritualistic attack on Paulinism, which is finally transformed into Catholicism by the Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, the Pastoral Epistles to Timothy and Titus, and the so-called Ignatian Epistles (p. 248). Augustine carries on the resultant theory, substituting membership of the Church for acceptance of Christ (p. 267). But Paulinism breaks out again in Wiclif and Huss, and in a less scholastic form in Luther. We, too, Professor Pfeleiderer seems to say, are heirs of Paulinism. The letter of our formulas kills, but the spirit gives life; we are not to throw away those formulas, but to interpret them. The Incarnation may be taken as the perpetual transformation of the soul of the believer; the Second Advent as the reformation of the world. The great multitude of Christians will, we fear, find these conclusions but a chilly kind of comfort; but each man must interpret his creed for himself. It will take a great deal of evidence—and in this work it is necessarily absent—to make us believe that the Synoptic Gospels mark three successive stages in a controversy; and the hypothesis of Deutero-Pauline Epistles seems to imply a conscious and deliberate forgery. Now, nothing seems to us clearer than that ancient literary forgeries, when not made simply to sell to book-collectors, were half-conscious and undeliberate. But whatever may be thought of his conclusions, no one can fail to respect the deep earnestness of conviction, the truly Christian spirit, which pervades his book. There is no animus against the ancient writers such as so often disfigures the works of reconstructors, whether of sacred or profane texts (notably Professor Wellhausen's); and, after all the transformation and reconstruction, the central doctrines of Christianity, as it seems to us, are untouched. But, as we said before, the lay reader is in danger of exaggerating the finality of the conclusions of scholars. Professor Pfeleiderer's work is only one of many attempts; not the final and dogmatic deliverance of scientific theology. Yet most of the laymen—and women—who read it will get the notion that they and Dr. Pfeleiderer have exhausted "Paulinism." But, regarded as a means of stimulating thought and research, it could hardly receive too high commendation.

Principal Edwards' work<sup>9</sup> originated, as he tells us, in a solitary and prolonged study of St. Paul's writings as a means of discovering his central principle. This he finds in the mystical union of Christ with the soul of the believer (p. 22)—a doctrine specially prominent in this epistle, and there used to solve all the practical problems dealt with. The epistle deals with modern questions, but solves them by an appeal to this mystical assumption—the unifying idea referred

<sup>9</sup> "A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians." By Thomas Charles Edwards, M.A., Principal of the University College of Wales. London: Hamilton, Adams & Co. 1885.

by St. Paul to an inward revelation, and combined by him with the Jewish moral doctrines of Law, Sin, and Atonement. Principal Edwards shows effectively in the body of the work how St. Paul applies this to marriage, to impurity, to the eating of things offered to idols, to the position of women, and to the other problems raised by the Corinthian Church. The most effective parts of the work are perhaps the Introduction, and the treatment of the Resurrection (p. 385 *seq.*). Men being united to Christ through faith, and Christ having become incarnate, the corporeal immortality of man must also be assumed. So far as we have been able to test the Commentary, it exhibits sound scholarship and wide acquaintance with the labours of previous commentators. We note by the way the frank adoption of the view that the early Christians were Eranistæ as a sign of the growth of the historical sense in theology. If Mr. Edwards is a little too anxious to get perfectly modern views from St. Paul as to slavery (pp. 183, 184), the position of women (p. 268), and the ritual question as to the use of the veil in prayer (p. 270 *seq.*), we can hardly blame him, and we can cordially commend his work as a whole.

We scarcely know to what class of readers Mr. Matheson's book<sup>10</sup> can be recommended. The student of Mr. Herbert Spencer knows it before; for the non-student it is far too diluted; and Mr. Spencer's doctrine is hardly the best representative of the "New Faith." But Mr. Matheson has, we think, drawn the legitimate inferences from Mr. Spencer's theory. The Old Faith and the New, he thinks, meet in it. The "Unknowable underlying the phenomenal world" is the Deity maintaining it, and every phenomenon is a special creation. Man posits the limit of his knowledge, and in a way transcends it, because he contains the principle which is beyond it (pp. 99, 100), a principle his possession of which is implied by the Incarnation (pp. 74, 75, cf. 91), and due to the breathing into him of the Divine life. Mr. Matheson, however—regardless of the Law of Parcimony and the Conservation of Energy—posits a free will (p. 233) and a separate immortal soul infused by the Creator (p. 193). He also brings forward with some force the argument from degeneration in Nature, and with less force that from spontaneity of variation (p. 170), which he regards as due to the will of the Unknowable. He ought to have seen that a "spontaneous variation" is merely a name for a variation whose special antecedent we will not or cannot assign. To refer all such variations to one power is to generalize a number of heterogeneous causes, to hypostatize the result, and to call it Power instead of Chance. And he should reflect that Causation, as we know it, is a relation solely between phenomena. You may be compelled to assume a Power, but Power as you know it is a hypostatized expectation, and you cannot get much satisfaction from that. And we must protest against his use of "Gnosticism" (p. 92) for the doctrine that religious belief is given by a special faculty, as well as

<sup>10</sup> "Can the Old Faith Live with the New?" By the Rev. G. Matheson, M.A., D.D. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood & Sons. 1885.

against his repudiation of the notion. The work is avowedly suggested in part by Drummond's "Natural Law," the rhetorical style of which has perceptibly influenced it. But it is more accurate than that greatly overrated work.

These sermons,<sup>11</sup> preached in St. Peter's, Vere Street, seem to make for a sort of Liberal Christianized Positivism. Faith in the Unknowable, Love of Humanity, aspiration after unending spiritual development, full acceptance of the doctrines of Natural Science—these are to be the leading features of Christianity in the future. Evangelicalism has prepared us for it, but must now give way before the Broad Church. Mr. Craufurd does not wholly escape the inaccuracy common to philosophizing preachers (*c.f.* his treatment of "Christian Agnosticism" and "Materialism"); and we should rather doubt whether his school will rest satisfied with his position. Will Canon Fremantle, for instance? But the subjects are, all things considered, dealt with effectively, and his tone and treatment deserve commendation.

This enlargement<sup>12</sup> of the hastily prepared edition brought out last year by the same editors seems to us one of the most complete and valuable of the numerous commentaries on the "Teaching." The matter of the discourse need not again be dealt with; it may suffice to say that these introductions and notes show thoroughly sound and scholarly work, and the reproduction of the conjectural restoration of the Two Ways by Krawuzcky, with which our editors incline to identify the document, may be read with interest, even by non-theologians, as a justification of "reconstructive criticism." The commentary, too, though mainly for experts, may be read with profit by any who are interested in scholarship. We cordially welcome this new evidence of the activity of America in theological learning.

Cyprian's historical importance, according to Herr Ritschl,<sup>13</sup> lies in the prominence he gives to the Episcopate. Each church is centred in its bishop, the whole Church in the body of bishops; so that he emphasizes and develops the conception of the Church as an outward visible organism (*cp.* p. 90). Herr Ritschl supports this view by an exhaustive examination of the Letters. The book—though, like the books of *Doctores* in general, rather too bulky—is an important contribution to the history of the development of Catholicism.

The fourth volume of Mr. Miller's commentary on the Articles<sup>14</sup> is a good, if somewhat compressed, summary of the doctrines of the most various schools on such themes as the Origin of Evil and the

<sup>11</sup> "The Unknown God, and other Sermons." By the Rev. Alexander Craufurd, M.A. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1885.

<sup>12</sup> "The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles." Edited, with a Translation, Introduction, and Notes, by Roswell D. Hitchcock and Francis Brown. Revised and Enlarged. London: J. C. Nimmo. 1885.

<sup>13</sup> "Cyprian von Karthago u. die Verfassung der Kirche." Von Otto Ritschl. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 1885. London: Trübner & Co.

<sup>14</sup> "The Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England: a Historical and Critical Exposition." By the Rev. Joseph Miller, B.D. Art. IX.—Hamartiology. London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co.; Hanley: Albert & Daniel. 1885.



Freedom of the Will, Infant Baptism and Original Sin. The citations range over a wide field, from Schopenhauer and Hartmann to Duns Scotus and the Sect of the Holy Spirit. The work is a temperate and effective plea for the *via media* of the Church of England, and is interesting as an example of the old-fashioned rational-dogmatic theology, which is rare in current religious literature.

We have not left ourselves space for more than a bare mention of Herr Seeberg's<sup>15</sup> thorough and exhaustive historical attack on the theory of the identity of Church and State put forward by Rothe and Strauss, and akin to Canon Fremantle's view, noticed last month in these pages; of Mr. Dwight H. Olmstead's<sup>16</sup> learned, but rather amateurish, plea for religious union on a purely moral basis; of Dr. Weiss' useful reprint and amplification of Meyer's commentary on Mark and Luke;<sup>17</sup> a commentary on the four Gospels, by Dr. Moritz Schwalb,<sup>18</sup> which apparently disintegrates and allegorizes them till very little is left; Miss Cobbe's<sup>19</sup> reprint of her excellent articles in the *Contemporary Review*; Colonel Olcott's addresses on Theosophy,<sup>20</sup> which we could hardly have approached with due seriousness; a prettily bound souvenir<sup>21</sup> of the seventh centenary of the Temple Church; a small book<sup>22</sup> "reconciling" Genesis and Geology, of small value except to the half-taught inquirer, but deserving praise for its frank acceptance of the Evolution doctrine, and containing the eccentric theory that the Tempter in Eden was the man studied by anthropology; the so-called "Jewish Life of Christ,"<sup>23</sup> which had much better have been left to scholars; and the Synoptic Gospels<sup>24</sup> in the "Parchment" series, a pretty little book, which we can only suppose must be meant to entice the æsthetic world into the study of the Gospels unawares.

<sup>15</sup> "Studien zur Geschichte des Begriffs der Kirche." Von Reinhold Seeberg. Erlangen: Deichert. 1885.

<sup>16</sup> "The Protestant Faith." By Dwight Hinckley Olmstead. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1885.

<sup>17</sup> "Kritisch exegetischer Handbuch über die Evangelien des Markus u. Lukas." Siebente Auflage (d. Meyer'schen Kommentars) neu umgearbeitet von Dr. Bernhard Weiss. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; London: Trubner. 1885.

<sup>18</sup> "Unsere vier Evangelien, erklärt und kritisch geprüft." Von Dr. Moritz Schwalb. Berlin: Carl Habel. 1885.

<sup>19</sup> "A Faithless World." By F. P. Cobbe. London: Williams & Norgate. 1885.

<sup>20</sup> "Theosophy, Religion, and Occult Science." By H. S. Olcott. London: George Redway. 1885.

<sup>21</sup> "Consecration of the Temple Church: Sermons preached at the Celebration of its Seven Hundredth Anniversary, by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Reader at the Temple, and the Master of the Temple." London: Macmillan & Co. 1885.

<sup>22</sup> "The Geology of Genesis." By G. Colpitts Robinson. London: Elliot Stock. 1885.

<sup>23</sup> "The Jewish Life of Christ." Edited by G. M. Foote and J. M. Wheeler. London: Progressive Publishing Company. 1885.

<sup>24</sup> "The Gospel according to Matthew, Mark, and Luke. Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1885. (Parchment Library.)

## PHILOSOPHY.

THE edition of the works of the late Professor Green, of which the first volume has now appeared,<sup>1</sup> will include a selection from his unpublished papers and all his printed works except the "Prolegomena to Ethics." The present volume contains the two "Introductions" to Hume's "Treatise," and Parts I. to V. of his criticism of Mr. Spencer and Mr. Lewes, first published in the *Contemporary Review*. The only part of the contents that has not appeared already is Part IV. of this criticism ("Mr. Lewes's account of the Social Medium," pp. 471-520), "withheld on account of Lewes's death in 1878, and not continued." Up to the point where the writing of this part of the criticism was discontinued, Green does not specially examine Lewes's doctrine of the social medium itself, but directs his attack against the metaphysical doctrines implied in the statement of it. His aim, here as elsewhere, is to show that "thought" cannot be explained as a development of "sense;" that whatever may be the history of the process by which man becomes conscious of the world, the world itself cannot exist otherwise than as a system of relations for a consciousness; and that this cannot be the individual consciousness, but must be a universal consciousness, not subject to the condition of time, and manifesting itself partially in the individual consciousness, so far as this acquires knowledge of the relations in which the reality of the world consists. "The object is always a relation or congeries of relations, and consciousness is the only medium in which relations exist for us." The point of the criticism on Lewes is that "the view of the real as a system of relations has established itself in his mind without dislodging the old view that the real is external matter, of which feeling is at once the effect and the presentation to consciousness." This criticism is, of course, fundamentally identical with that which Green directs against the experiential school generally; and from this newly published part alone an idea might be obtained of all the chief doctrines of his metaphysics. It is to be regretted that he did not go on to discuss in detail the doctrine of "the social medium" as stated by Lewes; for this is the strong point of Lewes's psychology. This doctrine is, besides, that in which thinkers of the school of Lewes find at least a partial explanation of the impersonal character of the relations in which objects are perceived, which for Green necessitates the assumption of an absolute or universal consciousness. We may, however, congratulate ourselves on having in the present volume and the "Prolegomena to Ethics" so full a presentation of Green's metaphysical doctrines.

<sup>1</sup> "Works of Thomas Hill Green, late Fellow of Balliol College, and White's Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Oxford." Edited by R. L. Nettleship, Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford. Vol. I. *Philosophical Works*. London: Longmans. 1885.

Mr. Bosanquet's book<sup>2</sup> is a contribution to that discussion and revision of logical principles which he regards as one of the most important sides of the contemporary movement of thought. The ground he takes is, to a great extent, common to him with Mr. Bradley, whose recent work, "*The Principles of Logic*," furnishes him with suggestions for the logical studies of the present volume. His criticism is not to be regarded as polemical, but rather as an attempt to bring out more clearly some of the ideas of Mr. Bradley's book. The following sentence is a good summary of Mr. Bosanquet's general position:—"The logical reason which compels us, in any judgment, to judge so and not otherwise, must be not a general and formal, but a special and individual necessity, relative to the individual judgment in question and to no other, and can only be found in the systematic relations of knowledge which at the moment form the totality of the intellect's world." This is, in fact, the central position in philosophy as in logic of the school to which Mr. Bosanquet belongs. As stated here, it is the logical aspect of their doctrine of the ideal of knowledge as a system of relations. The side of it which he emphasizes is that which identifies the ideal with the complete reality. "Reality, alike for feeling and for intellect, is the world in which we live; a world which is sustained and transformed by the patient labour of the intellect and will, but can only be maimed and degraded by the impatience which splits it into a shadow, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, a substance more shadowy still." He seems to himself to detect in Mr. Bradley a certain tendency to separate the world of ideas from the real world—a tendency which shows itself in logic under the form of an unqualified separation of "fact" and "inference." At the same time he remarks that some of his observations are directed rather against his own "probable misunderstanding" of Mr. Bradley than against any view which he believes him actually to hold. Mr. Bradley seems to him to have been too much influenced by "the German reaction"—"a reaction partly determined by those very influences of English speculation which we hope that the present generation has in some degree outgrown." He is afraid that sympathy with this "reaction" may in England "restore the rule of traditions which we are just beginning to lay aside." In that case "adherents of commonplace empiricism would simply imagine that their German neighbours had regained a sound mind, and had admitted idealism to be a blunder." The German "idealistic" movement, from Kant to Hegel is, of course, that which Mr. Bosanquet regards as the movement in advance. It is scarcely necessary to say that an exactly corresponding view might be taken by an empiricist, in which the positions of the two schools would be inverted. It might be admitted, for example, that the criticism directed by Green against English philosophy was necessary, but that, after all, it is only valuable as criticism; that when a new construction is attempted it must be on empirical lines. An in-

<sup>2</sup> "*Knowledge and Reality: a Criticism of Mr. F. H. Bradley's 'Principles of Logic.'*" By Bernard Bosanquet, M.A., late Fellow and Tutor of University College, Oxford. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1885.

cidental remark, which it may perhaps be worth while to make, occurs with reference to Mr. Bosanquet's use of the term "idealism." This term has been used most frequently by English philosophical writers as an antithesis to materialism or dualism. Mr. Bosanquet, in common with other writers of his school, opposes it to empiricism. This use has some disadvantages, for in referring to Berkeley, for example, they have to speak of his "empirical idealism."

Mr. Davidson's "Logic of Definition"<sup>3</sup> is less connected with general philosophy than Mr. Bosanquet's book. It is, at the same time, less minutely critical. The reader must not expect very acute or subtle analysis or classification. No attempt is made to get much below the ordinary common-sense distinctions of things and ideas. There is, however, a good deal of useful matter in the book. Classification and division, such as is to be found here, more minute and systematic than that of the dictionary, yet without any attempt to set the mind of the student to work dissolving the distinctions of common sense, is of course quite worth the trouble that is spent on it, although its importance is not strictly philosophical. In discussing philosophical, and especially ethical, terms, Mr. Davidson's tendency is to analyse rather less than the plan of his work would have permitted. But when this has been said, it must also be mentioned, in justice to him and to avoid misunderstanding, that he is not an unhesitating adherent of any "philosophy of common sense." Here, for example, are some remarks on that term itself, and Sir William Hamilton's use of it:—

One might almost suspect a touch of irony in the expression "so determinate" (applied by Hamilton to the term common sense as distinguished from reason) for in Note A alone (of his edition of Reid), Hamilton himself employs common sense in some half dozen different significations. He applies it to a "doctrine," to a "philosophy," to an "argument." At one time he puts it for "the complement of those cognitions and convictions which we receive from Nature," which he also identifies with the date of consciousness. At another time he represents it as an original source or origin of knowledge, "a fountain of truths intelligible." So determinate indeed!

In an appendix (pp. 319-330) an abstract is given of the treatise of Boethius' "De Divisione."

Dr. McCosh is publishing in America a series, in two parts—the first "didactic" and the second "historical"—to show that "later science and philosophy" has not "set aside old truths in religion and philosophy." No. VII.<sup>4</sup> and No. VIII.<sup>5</sup> belong to the historical part of the series. In these two numbers the "truth and error" in Kant and Herbert Spencer is "carefully pointed out." A discussion

<sup>3</sup> "The Logic of Definition Explained and Applied." By William L. Davidson, M.A., Minister of Bourtie. London: Longmans. 1885.

<sup>4</sup> "A Criticism of the Critical Philosophy." By James McCosh, D.D., LL.D., D.L., President of Princeton College; author of "Intuitions of the Mind," &c. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1884.

<sup>5</sup> "Herbert Spencer's Philosophy as Culminated in his Ethics." Examined by James McCosh, D.D., LL.D., D.L., &c. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1885.

of their doctrines, from the point of view of orthodoxy and the "philosophy of common sense," cannot have much interest for Kantians or Spencerians; but it may, perhaps, be useful in bringing the minds of those who read apologetic literature in contact with philosophical ideas about which they might never have heard anything. Probably apologetic literature has often done good in this way. Unfortunately, the ideas of Kant and Mr. Spencer lose nearly all their stimulating power in the process of transmission through the sober medium of Dr. McCosh's style.

Whatever may be thought of Dr. McCosh's philosophy adapted to theology and "common sense," it must at any rate be admitted that the two Numbers just noticed of his "Philosophic Series" contrast favourably with the 565 pages of diluted commonplace which Dr. Porter sends forth under the title "Elements of Moral Science."<sup>6</sup> As an example of his style, his six arguments to prove "the importance and dignity of this study" may be quoted. "Moral Science" is important because (1) "Duty is a legitimate and worthy object of scientific inquiry." (2) "The science of duty is necessary as a preparation for public life." (3) "The study of moral science is practically useful. Its natural and almost necessary tendency is to lead men to think of duty, and consequently to believe in duty." (4) "Moral Science is also often needed as a guide to correct answers to practical questions of duty." (5) "Moral Science is not superfluous, but is the more necessary for those who accept a supernatural revelation of duty." (6) "The study of Moral Science is favourable to faith in the Christian revelation."

Most writers would gain by comparison with Dr. Porter, and Mr. Raymond S. Perrin (also an American) is not an exception. His book on "The Religion of Philosophy,"<sup>7</sup> is, however, too long. It is a paradox for which much might be said that absence of leisure is the cause of a certain diffuseness of style. America, it will be admitted, is the country where there is least leisure. Hence American writers who are not of the first class are more diffuse than the same classes of writers in other countries. It ought to be a truism that when any one has read up the history of philosophy in Lewes, it is not necessary for him to communicate his information to the public in 207 not very small printed pages. Yet this is what Mr. Perrin does in the first part of his book, entitled "The Scope of Language." In the second part, "The Nature of Perception," he summarizes the general philosophy of Lewes himself, and of Mr. Spencer. In the third part he gives a history of religion from the religion of the ancient Egyptians down to his own "Religion of Philosophy." The new religion, on behalf of which he appeals "to the women of America," is founded on

<sup>6</sup> "The Elements of Moral Science: Theoretical and Practical." By Noah Porter, D.D., LL.D., President of Yale College. London: Sampson Low. 1885.

<sup>7</sup> "The Religion of Philosophy; or the Unification of Knowledge. A Comparison of the Chief Philosophical and Religious Systems of the World, made with a view to reducing the Categories of Thought, or the most general terms of Existence, to a single Principle, thereby establishing a true Conception of God." By Raymond S. Perrin. London: Williams & Norgate. 1885.

the principle that motion is the central fact in the universe. Motion expresses itself in man as action; hence the religion of philosophy is founded on, if not identical with, morality. This religion is contrasted with the religions of Faith, in distinction from which it rejects all anthropomorphic theology. At the end of his book the author gives some good advice on politics and morals.

Mr. Wilson's aim in his "Thoughts on Science, Theology, and Ethics" <sup>8</sup> is very much like that of Mr. Perrin, but he has more power of simple and condensed statement. He opposes all anthropomorphic theology, and contends that ethics will survive theology, and will even be the better for the disappearance of the theological sanction; for all attempts at reconciliation of science and theology have an injurious effect on the habit of intellectual truthfulness. There is, of course, nothing very new in all this; but it is just as well that some one should from time to time express truths of this order with regard to the relations of theology and ethics, thus making it impossible for the official "reconcilers of science and religion" to say their arguments are unanswerable. Creeds and institutions, besides, do not die of mere spontaneous decomposition; from a practical point of view, therefore, answering Christian apologists is not altogether superfluous, whatever we may think of the process intellectually. The following passage will show that Mr. Wilson can express himself with vigour:—  
 "A theologian has the same hatred and fear of science as one has of a wicked dog by which he has got terribly worried. There is but one way of safety for him; let him keep outside the length of the chain. The scientist being bound by the chain, as we may call it, of verification, cannot pursue the theologian into the unknowable; here, then, let the theologian remain." The argument of the first part of the book is that the theological and the scientific modes of thought are absolutely incompatible; the theologian cannot use the methods of science without destroying theology. In the second part the author's view of ethics as a social product, and as capable of complete independence of the supernatural sanction, is set forth clearly and forcibly. The idea of the inevitable and enduring natural consequences of right and wrong action has impressed itself strongly on his mind.

In twenty pages Dr. Hardwicke gives a sketch of the history of the universe from the primitive nebula to the "present commanding position" of the human race, together with a view of the meaning of the world, the meaning of man, and his chances of immortality. He should hardly call himself an Agnostic, for although he admits that "the Agnostic philosopher cannot logically demonstrate the evidence of the Divine Being," he asserts, a few lines after, that "the something

<sup>8</sup> "Thoughts on Science, Theology, and Ethics." By John Wilson, M.A., Trinity College, Dublin. London: Trübner. 1885.

<sup>9</sup> "Man: Whence and Whither?" A Lecture delivered at Sheffield on October 20, 1884, in Channing Hall, and on November 3, 1884, in Cutler's Hall. By H. J. Hardwicke, M.D. Reprinted from *The Agnostic*. Sheffield: published by the Author. 1885.

controlling Nature," which we are compelled to assume, the "ultimate reality," although "utterly incomprehensible," "is intelligent." Superficially this looks more like Theism than Agnosticism. Then again, "reason tells us clearly that we are here for a well-ordained purpose." The next clause, however, is disappointing: for "what that purpose is we cannot tell." The author refuses to admit that consciousness can disappear altogether; yet we cannot continue to exist after death "as conscious individuals." The question that puzzles him is, "What becomes of the huge force developed during the lifetime of the bodily organism?" His opinion is that "this human force, which is the outcome of the ultimate atoms of the plasm life-molecules, will, at the death of the body, be reabsorbed into the great animating spirit of the universe, and partake of the nature and properties of the Unknown. . . . We may safely leave the matter to be dealt with according to the wisdom of that unknown cause of all things, resting quite assured that we shall be far better disposed of than we could possibly dispose of ourselves, even if we had the power." The author here seems to trust in Providence as devoutly as the most devout Theist. In the next sentence he tells us that "we must bow the head in a truly scientific manner, and reply to the great question, 'I cannot tell.'" Then he concludes with two not very recondite quotations from "the immortal Shakespeare" (p. 20).

## SCIENCE.

THERE are believed to be about 222,000 species of insects, and to this enormous assemblage Mr. Kirby, of the British Museum, offers an Introduction in an "Elementary Text-book of Entomology."<sup>1</sup> Details of course are not to be looked for; and when we mention that little more than a page is given to every thousand species, it is obvious that neither species nor genera can be described. The author accordingly limits himself to an account of the several orders and families. The beetles, which number 93,000 species, are described in eighty pages, but brief as this space is, the author contrives in it to draw attention to the characters and habits of many interesting and familiar genera and species. The Orthoptera, which number 7,000 species, are disposed of in seven pages, not without notice of the earwigs, cockroaches, crickets, locusts, grasshoppers, and mantidæ. The Neuroptera, with their 4,000 species, comprising dragon-flies, may-flies, stone-flies, white ants, bird lice, black-fly, springtails, together with the caddis-flies, are excellently summarized in about fourteen pages. The treatment is too brief to admit of the introduction of stories of insect life, and the volume will be chiefly valuable as giving, with scientific accuracy, the characters of the principal groups,

<sup>1</sup> "Elementary Text-book of Entomology." By W. F. Kirby. With Eighty-seven Plates, containing over 650 Figures. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1885.

so as to pave the student's way for more detailed study. The treatment is symmetrical, corresponding space being given to Hymenoptera, Lepidoptera, Hemiptera, and Diptera. The value of the volume is augmented by eighty-six page plates, which are arranged systematically, so as to present species in the several families. We have no doubt the volume will prove valuable to those who devote themselves to the systematic side of entomology and to collectors.

There are few departments of natural history better suited to engage general interest and familiar study than our land and fresh water shells. Many excellent works like Turton's have already ministered to the wants of the more scientific collectors; but there was room for a briefer guide better suited to the wants of youth, and this has been well supplied by the careful manual which Mr. Adams now places before us.<sup>2</sup> It is just the sort of book which he may expect in the near future to make its way into public schools, when cultivation of the observing faculties and reasoning about physical facts come to be regarded as among the best instruments in the hands of the educator. The Introduction is brief, merely drawing attention to ways and means of collecting and dealing with shells after they have been found. And when the species are characterized, with notes on their varieties, something is said as to the localities in which they occur. The genera are not often defined, and when characterized, the distinctive features are briefly given; but pains have been taken to make the identification of species and their varieties easy. Appendices contrast the species of Zonites and Vertigo. There is a glossary of technical terms, an index of systematic names, and nine plates, in eight of which excellent figures have been given of the species, from drawings by G. W. Adams and the author.

Professor Remsen's "Introduction to the Study of the Compounds of Carbon"<sup>3</sup> is a brief and simple textbook. Written for beginners, and especially for medical students and others for whom organic substances have a professional interest, it is to be commended for clearness and practical exposition. The tendency of modern books is to relieve the reader from much of the labour which was formerly necessary to master a subject, and this is brought about by approximating the written exposition in part to the oral exposition of the lecture or demonstration; and although, in the absence of the appliances of the lecture-table, this method may be less conducive to the attainment of mastery by the student, no such result need be feared from Professor Remsen's book, provided the reader performs the experiments which are occasionally mentioned in the volume. The volume is divided

---

<sup>2</sup> "The Collector's Manual of British Land and Freshwater Shells. Containing Figures and Descriptions of every Species, an Account of their Habits and Localities, Hints on Preserving and Arranging, &c.; the Names and Descriptions of all the Varieties, and Synoptical Tables showing the Differences of Species hard to Identify." By L. E. Adams, B.A. Illustrated by G. W. Adams and the Author. London: George Bell & Sons. 1884.

<sup>3</sup> "An Introduction to the Study of the Compounds of Carbon, or Organic Chemistry." By Ira Remsen, Professor of Chemistry in the Johns Hopkins University. Boston: Ginn, Heath & Co. 1885.



into twenty-one chapters, which vary in length with the subject treated of, and, as the student is supposed to have little more than a smattering of chemistry in commencing his studies, the Introduction briefly explains apparatus for purification of carbon compounds, determination of melting-point, methods of analysis, formulæ, and the classification of carbon compounds. The author's advice to the beginner is expressed in the following way:—"Study with great care the reactions of compounds; study the methods of making them, and the decompositions which they undergo; the formulas are but the condensed expressions of the conclusions which are drawn from the reactions." The second chapter is devoted to methane and ethane, as examples of homologous series. Then succeed the halogen derivatives of these substances; and this leads to the oxygen derivatives, alcohols, ethers, aldehydes, and acids. The fifth chapter gives the sulphur derivatives, such as sulphur alcohols, sulphur ethers, and sulphonic acids. The nitrogen derivatives introduce cyanogen and hydrocyanic acid, with the various cyanides, cyanates, and sulphocyanates. And to this chapter is appended some account of substituted ammonias and nitro-compounds. Then succeed derivatives of ethane and methane which contain phosphorus and arsenic. Thus, by comparing the derivatives of two hydrocarbons, the student is brought into familiarity with the chief classes of carbon compounds. With the eighth chapter we are introduced to the marsh-gas hydrocarbons or paraffins. After a short account of petroleum, and the products obtained from it by refining, the synthesis and isomerism of paraffins is discussed. Then we pass on to the oxygen derivatives of the paraffin series, and in the tenth chapter to other derivatives of paraffin. The next chapter is devoted to the carbohydrates; and we thus pass to mixed compounds containing nitrogen, and learn, in the thirteenth chapter, to distinguish between saturated and unsaturated carbon compounds. The aromatic compounds, or benzene series of hydrocarbons, is then introduced and examined by the same methods as the preceding types, passing from a consideration of coal-tar, through the benzene series, to the aniline dyes. Having thus discussed the saturated hydrocarbons of the marsh-gas series, the unsaturated hydrocarbons related to the paraffins, and hydrocarbons which contain residues of the saturated paraffins and of benzene, the author passes on to phenyl-ethylene, and concludes with a short notice of glucocides and alkaloids. Thus many familiar subjects are omitted such as engage attention in physiological chemistry, but great clearness of conception is attained, and we believe the book likely to be useful to students and teachers.

Professor Henrici's "*Geometry*" has been reviewed in a supplement to "*Euclid and his Modern Rivals*,"<sup>4</sup> which is paged continuously with the original work and headed "*Act ii. Scene vi.—Treatment of Parallels by Revolving Lines.*" In this remarkable review a gentleman named Minos, who is a University examiner, has been commissioned by the

---

<sup>4</sup> "*Supplement to Euclid and his Modern Rivals, containing a notice of Henrici's 'Geometry,' together with Selections from the Reviews.*" London: Macmillan & Co. 1885.

ghost of Euclid to criticize the works of his modern rivals, and Herr Niemand, who is described as a ghostly professor, appears as counsel for Mr. Henrici, as he had already appeared for many other writers. Whether it is that Professor Niemand is at a disadvantage in not being a University examiner, or that Minos has become less impartial by having accepted that office, is not quite clear; but Niemand is certainly about the feeblest advocate who could have been retained. Mr. Dodgson's discussion is of a kind to appeal to young men. It is amusing rather than convincing. Appendix VII. reprints various reviews of "Euclid and his Modern Rivals" to which the author adds comments and intercalations of his own, which constitute a review of the reviewers.

Mr. Edward Clodd's "Myths and Dreams"<sup>5</sup> is a popular discussion of these subjects with a view to illustrating how the pre-historic races of men interpreted the world around them in their own ideas and aspirations. Through all this there runs a faith in evolution and a desire to explain the origin of supernatural beliefs. The first part of the book is devoted to myth, and discusses its primitive meaning. Under the title "Confusion Between the Living and the Not Living," familiar superstitions are detailed as to the ways in which inanimate things affect or may be affected by men. A section on personification of the powers of Nature sets out the belief found among various peoples concerning the earth and heavens, light and darkness, and the devil, with a view of showing how man has translated himself into Nature. Then follow the solar theory of myth, belief in the metamorphosis of men into animals, belief in descent of men from animals and plants, the survival of myth in history and myth among the Hebrews. From which discussions the author concludes that myth is the mental and spiritual history of mankind. The second part of the book deals with dreams and beliefs in the supernatural. There is, perhaps, no very sharp line to be drawn between these two parts of the subject. The author contents himself with discussing the dreams of barbaric peoples; and, having touched on such matters as the reality of dreams, and the belief in a second self or soul, passes on to the soul's nature, belief in the souls of animals, plants and inanimate things, the soul's dwelling-place, and the belief in dreams as a means of communication between gods and men. A large amount of information is here brought together, and the papers are well written. Many of them have already appeared in *Knowledge*, and they are well suited to stimulate thought among such readers as form the majority of the reading public.

The "Chemistry of Cookery"<sup>6</sup> is an attempt to interest the general public in the preparation and use of food. It is thoroughly readable, full of interest, with enough of the author's personality to give a piquancy to the stories told. Nothing would be likely to diffuse

<sup>5</sup> "Myths and Dreams." By Edward Clodd. London: Chatto & Windus.<sup>4</sup> 1885.

<sup>6</sup> "The Chemistry of Cookery." By W. Mattieu Williams. London: Chatto & Windus. 1885.

health and domestic enjoyment more than the practical application of such teaching as the author gives, but there is probably no portion of the house in which conservatism is more dominant than in the kitchen; and, unless the mistress of the house is prepared to undertake a degree of supervision which practically makes her her own servant, there is very little chance in the majority of cases of cookery being carried on with the aid of the thermometer and other scientific appliances; yet the working powers of most individuals are more or less influenced by their food, and are probably curtailed to a greater extent than is usually believed by want of knowledge of the chemistry of cookery. In the Introduction the author gives a short notice of Count Rumford and his contributions to the science of cookery. Then follows a chapter on boiling water, in which the properties of "cooked water," as the author terms it, are discussed. Chapters follow upon albumen, illustrating its cookery, but interesting the reader perhaps still more by stories which have no direct bearing on the subject. Gelatin, fibrin, and the juices of meat, occupy a chapter, and this naturally leads to roasting and grilling, Count Rumford's roaster, and Warren's cooking-pot, and in these chapters enough is stated to enable every one to roast or grill to perfection with, we may add, a little practice. Other chapters are devoted to frying and stewing. These are both prime arts, highly conducive, like grilling and roasting, to development of the observing and reasoning faculties. The reader will find many new suggestions in detail. Thus Mr. Williams assures us that apple fritters may be cooked in the same fat as was used for fish without acquiring a fishy flavour; while directions are given for purification of the fat when necessary. With chapter ix. we commence the examination of foods, and the place of honour is given by the author to cheese. There is certainly no article of food so rarely cooked in this country, and probably cheese soufflés and cheese fondu are likely to be as nutritious as are cheese porridge, cheese pudding, and the innumerable dishes into which Continental cookery has introduced cheese as an inexpensive nutritive food. Fat and milk similarly occupy a chapter, and attention is drawn to the use of borax in arresting lactic fermentation, and to the advantages of buying oleomargarine at 8½d. a pound, rather than the same substance under the name of butter at more than twice the price, it being the experience of buttermen that while no one will buy "bosh" as bosh, no one objects to pay 1s. 6d. a pound for bosh when termed "prime Devonshire butter." The cookery of vegetables, of bread, tea and coffee, wine, malted food, are all discussed so as to exhibit science with practice. A chapter is included on Count Rumford's cheap cookery, which might be taken to heart by guardians of the poor throughout the country, since Count Rumford, while making every one cleanly and comfortable, did so not only without cost to taxpayers, but so as to produce a substantial profit.

Common British fossils would probably have been collected more freely had popular and reliable handbooks for their study been accessible. Many a young student, especially in country places, will

be grateful to Mr. Taylor<sup>7</sup> for the volume with which he designs to help the amateur collector. Much remains to be done in this country in developing the observing powers as an aid in education, and there are few studies more stimulating or better adapted to the activities of youth than such as follow from the study of fossils as they occur in Nature. In this country we are probably more backward in such education than in any country in Europe. We remember, on one occasion, overtaking in the Eifel, a postman who had an excellent knowledge of minerals; and at Pelm found the boys at the quarries well instructed in the generic names of fossils. It is too much to hope that any book will help British children to a like knowledge, which can only come from teaching by means of specimens; but Mr. Taylor's volume should send many lovers of Nature to cliff, quarry and cutting. The book is essentially a series of thirteen popular lectures on the invertebrata. The subject, though lightly touched upon, emphasizes many points of great interest. It may perhaps be doubted whether too many names of fossils have not sometimes been mentioned without indications which would convey any meaning to the reader; but since there are upwards of 330 figures, enough has probably been done to direct attention to the general nature of fossils which can be found in most museums. The chapters are devoted to sponges, corallines, corals, encrinites, star-fishes, sea-urchins, worms, trilobites and other crustacea, sea-mats, lamp-shells, and the mollusca.

Coleman's "British Butterflies"<sup>8</sup> is too well known to need any words of introduction, and its merits have gained a reputation among young collectors. The present issue is a reprint of previous editions, as though it had passed entirely beyond editorial control, and were regarded by the publishers as incapable of improvement, or, at least, good enough for the boys and girls who may use it. The excellency of the figures and the brevity of the descriptions, with the localities for species, notes on the caterpillars, chrysalids, and habits, will always make the volume acceptable. The Introduction, giving some account of butterflies in a popular manner, extends to sixty-two pages. The account of the species extends to 110 pages, and is illustrated with fourteen coloured plates. Another plate is devoted to forms of caterpillar and chrysalis, and one plate represents the scales, antennæ, and eggs. The cheaper edition is more closely printed on smaller paper, and has the plates uncoloured.

The Japanese are taking a prominent part in the study of earthquake phenomena, and the "Transactions of the Seismological Society of Japan"<sup>9</sup> are not inferior in interest to any similar pub-

<sup>7</sup> "Our Common British Fossils and Where to Find Them. A Handbook for Students." By J. E. Taylor, Ph.D., F.G.S., &c. With 330 Illustrations. London: Chatto & Windus. 1885.

<sup>8</sup> "British Butterflies. Figures and Descriptions of Every Native Species, with an Account of Butterfly Development, Structure, Habits, Localities, Mode of Capture and Preservation." By W. S. Coleman. The Illustrations printed in Colours by Edmund Evans. London: George Routledge & Sons.

<sup>9</sup> "Transactions of the Seismological Society of Japan." Vol. VII. Part II. London: Trübner & Co. 1884.

lication. In the present part Professor John Milne gives an account of 3,087 earthquakes observed in North Japan between October, 1881, and October, 1883. The author records that he distributed bundles of post-cards to Government offices in all important towns within 100 miles of Tokio, with the request that a card should be posted every week with a notice of the earthquakes which occurred. These communications prove that almost every earthquake comes to Tokio from the North, and passes South-west to the Hakone mountains, where it stops. As a rule, earthquakes are limited to the eastern side of the country. The results obtained are set out on 123 maps, upon which the distribution of hills is indicated by shading, so as to define the land lying at a lower level than 500 feet. The places where the earthquakes have been observed are indicated by numbers. The greatest number of earthquakes was felt at Asaw, which lies to the north of Yokohama. Some of the disturbances are felt simultaneously at distant spots, but not noticed at intermediate regions. It appears that 218 shocks originated beneath the ocean, 137 on or near the sea border, while only sixty-four originated inland. The district most shaken was the alluvial plain which follows the line of the river Tonegawa, in which more than half the recorded earthquakes originated. The conditions of the affected region are compared with those of earthquake areas on the Pacific coast of South America. Earthquakes are most numerous in winter, the proportion in winter being three and a half times that of summer. From one to three earthquakes occur every day in Japan, and the author regards it as probable that from twenty to fifty earthquakes occur every day in other parts of the world.

There is a class of Indian relics termed gorget stones. They are perforated tablets of slate, found in all parts of the United States. One of these, known as the Lenape stone,<sup>10</sup> is honoured with a memoir, for the purpose of elucidating the relation of the American Indian to the Mammoth. On the stone is carved a picture of a combat between Indians and an elephant. In the words of the author, the monster, angry and with erect tail, approaches the forest, in which, through the pine trunks, are seen the wigwams of an Indian village, and the story is deciphered in all its details; and then, having aroused our interest in the subject, the writer draws upon the traditions of the Indian chiefs to substantiate his argument, that the Mammoth was hunted by man in America as in Europe. The form of the elephant is indeed represented in the elephant mound of Grant County, Wisconsin, but that, like the elephant pipes of Iowa, represents an animal without tusks. Priests' head-dresses in Mexico, and some features of temples in Yucatan, appear to indicate elephants, and when these evidences are contrasted with the incised bones from the caves of Perigord, the resemblance is sufficiently close to enable us to accept the author's conclusions. The reverse side of the gorget stone is also incised, but a stronger effort of the imagination is needed to unravel

---

<sup>10</sup> "The Lenape Stone; or, the Indian and the Mammoth." By H. C. Mercer. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1885.

the story. A curious appendix includes many sworn statements going to prove the genuineness of the tablet.

A small French Botanical Glossary, by M. Stephen Artault, has just appeared.<sup>11</sup> It is a handbook explanatory of the terms used in botany, and is likely to be of great service to all botanical students, especially to beginners. Opposite every page of text is placed a blank page, on which drawings or notes may be made by the student.

This volume, which forms one of a series of "Contributions to Surgery and Medicine,"<sup>12</sup> contains, like the rest of the author's works, a large amount of useful matter, the value of which is enhanced by its originality. Mr. Thomas has taken much pains—apparently not without success—in demonstrating the fallacies of the lately accepted theories of the Warton Hood school, including the supposed benefits of bone-setting and manipulative interference as taught and practised by them; while he has made it equally clear that the predecessors of the present generation of surgeons were right in principle, though they failed to carry their principle into practice. The most striking and valuable contributions to the surgery of the joints which the work contains are those on the undoubted signs of disease and inflammation and of recovery; on the infallible modes of avoiding deformity; and on a safe method of correcting already existing deformities. Although all revolutionary changes, whether in the political or scientific world, can only be effected after years of opposition, we can congratulate Mr. Thomas on the fact that his practice at least, if not his theories, is now accepted by surgeons in all parts of Europe and the United States. Perhaps one reason of its ready acceptance is that it tends rather in the direction of saving joints and restoring them to their original condition than of sacrificing them, and in this way interfering with the usefulness of the limb for the sake of gaining what is after all a comparatively short period of time. It requires no scientific mind to comprehend that the highest art of the surgeon is to save the affected structure, and that, although its removal in whole or part may often be the best alternative that can be adopted, it is after all an admission on his part that he is unable to preserve it and restore it to usefulness. The success of the system which the author enjoins as a means to the preservation and restoration of the joint depends, he tells us, upon the consistency and entirety of its employment. The system itself is that of complete rest, fixation—not ankylosis—and entire absence of manipulative interference. The prevention and treatment of deformities as laid down in this work form a special feature of it. The success which the author claims for the plans which he enjoins is no doubt due to the fact that they emanate from the mind of a true mechanic, and it

<sup>11</sup> "Glossologie Botanique." Par M. Stephen Artault, Préparateur de Travaux Pratiques à la Faculté de Médecine de Paris. Paris: Librairie Allier-Henry, 18, Rue de l'Ecole de Médecine.

<sup>12</sup> "Contributions to Surgery and Medicine. Part II. Principles of the Treatment of Diseased Joints." By H. O. Thomas, M.R.C.S., Liverpool. London: H. K. Lewis.

is his thorough knowledge of mechanics which enables him so readily to detect a deformity, the forces which determine it, and the means to adopt in order to remove or counteract them; and it is his application of this knowledge to his art which has led to the evolution of a system of surgical appliances which has gained him a world-wide reputation. It is unfortunate that the book is not illustrated, for the better information of those who are not personally acquainted with its writer's practice and appliances. Its phraseology, too, presents many crudities which deprive it of a finish it would otherwise possess. They cannot be the result of want of practice as a writer, as Mr. Thomas has been a large contributor to surgical literature, but from his general style we can only suppose them to be instances of the eccentricities which genius is known to affect. This, however, while it is an undoubted fault, does not deprive the book of its usefulness nor detract from the value of its information. Its perusal will repay any one who is interested in the subject, and will convince him that the medical profession and the public are indebted to its author for having evolved a system which may be fairly termed a sign of a marked advance in the science of conservative surgery.

## HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

IN America the word "pre-historic" has a very wide range, extending from the period when the mastodon and the megatherium roamed through the trackless forests till some four hundred years ago. The recent researches chronicled by the Marquis de Nadaillac<sup>1</sup> show that man existed in the New World as in the Old in the Quaternary period, and further that the earliest vestiges of man in America and Europe closely resemble each other. The arrows of pink quartz with which a mastodon in Benton County, Missouri, was slain might have been found, as far as their shape go, in France or Germany, though the carapace of a glyptodon used as the roof of the cave of a primitive man has, as far as we remember, not been found elsewhere than in America. As this only measures about six feet by four, the hole under it cannot have been much more than bachelor's quarters. The finding of detached human bones with other débris, some broken evidently to extract the marrow, show that the primæval noble savage had already acquired a taste for "long pig," to use a Fiji phrase. The builders of the strange mounds which cover the valleys of the Mississippi, the Ohio, and the Missouri were once supposed to have been folk of the same sort; but fuller investigation and more sober judgment has led American antiquaries to adopt the theory that they are probably the work of "the Red Indians of historic times, or of their immediate ancestors," which we take to mean not long before the discovery of America by Europeans. This

<sup>1</sup> "Pre-historic America." By the Marquis de Nadaillac. Translated by N. D'Anvers. London: John Murray. 1885.

has been proved principally by the objects found in them. The pottery, the pieces of shell, the stone and copper knives, are such as would be found among the débris of a recent Indian village, and few archæologists could pick out the ancient objects if mixed up with more modern ones. Among the pottery is a cup with an owl's head on the handle, at least as good as those which delighted the eyes of Dr. Schliemann when he unearthed them "far on the ringing plains of windy Troy." Another similar cup has the head of a fox on the handle. Human faces and snakes are also common, and in Illinois some small copper jewels in the shape of turtles were found wrapped up in coverings made of vegetable tissue and of some stuff woven with hair. Pipes, too, are common objects, all of fanciful shapes, showing that the habit of smoking must have been an old one. The manufacture must have continued for many years, perhaps centuries, before a workman could make a pipe in the shape of a wild cat or a heron. More wonderful than these mounds are the cliff dwellings in Colorado and New Mexico, which were in ruins when the Spaniards, who were the first to enter Central America, came upon them in their victorious march. These were probably fortresses, cities of refuge for the inhabitants of the *pueblos* or lowland villages, and are built of brick and limestone on the faces of cliffs which are almost inaccessible to the explorer. Their desertion is ascribed to the invasions of nomad Indians, and to the gradual diminution of rainfall in consequence of the destruction of the forests, which rendered agriculture, on which the people depended for their sustenance, impossible. The Marquis does not confine his researches to these extinct peoples, of whom nothing is known except from their ruins, but gives also some account of the Aztecs and the Peruvians, who were seen by the explorers of the Old World in all the splendour of their peculiar civilization. The translation reads pleasantly—a rare merit in a translation. Illustrations are profusely scattered over the pages, but are not as good as the text deserves. They are coarsely executed and indistinct. Archæological engravings need not, perhaps, be artistic, but above all things they should be clear.

Nine months ago we noticed the second volume of the translation of M. Duruy's "History of Rome,"<sup>2</sup> and now the third volume, in two parts, is before the public. Like its predecessors, it abounds in illustrations, not very relevant all of them, nor of the highest rank in point of art, but, being all taken from original antiques, they are a decided advance on the tragic scenes and impossible costumes which adorned old-fashioned Histories of the Mistress of the World. These two parts carry on the story to the commencement of the rule of Augustus, and there will be a good many more, if the work is continued on the same scale, before it closes with the victory of Constantine and the Cross. A considerable portion of the first part is devoted to a discussion of the state of Ancient Gaul written *con amore*, and their resistance to Cæsar is described as heroic. M. Duruy forgets, how-

---

<sup>2</sup> "History of Rome and the Roman People." By Victor Duruy. Edited by Rev. J. P. Mahaffy. Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1884.



ever, that the Roman success was in great part due to Gallic dissension and jealousy, and Cæsar himself talks of setting Gaul against Gaul to save the lives of his valuable soldiers. In the description of Germany and the Germans he refuses to accept Tacitus as more than a poetic historian, who painted the noble savage in glowing colours as a contrast to the vices of civilization. "The Book of Tacitus is the historic gospel of our neighbours, and they have extracted from it a number of admirable things for the honour of their race. With imprudent generosity, our scholars have long supported them in their pretensions to see in modern civilization no factor but Germanism, *das Germanenthum*, as if the other nations had lived inert and silent until the new revelation had come down from the Germanic Sinai. By declining to ascribe to the Gauls all the virtues which have been attributed to them, we gain the right of refusing to the Germans the glory which they confer on themselves." Can anything be more delightfully naïve than the last phrase? The reader will see, from this revelation of the forces which work on his mind, that M. Duruy can hardly be taken as a guide in serious historical studies, but his style of narration is vivid and sympathetic, and he may be safely followed when prejudices do not stand in his way.

Owing to the increasing liberality of the Papal Court to scholars, the contents of the archives at the Vatican are gradually becoming more and more known to the public. For some years the English Government has been permitted to have transcripts made of documents and papers concerning England—a duty which is performed with great zeal and discretion by Mr. W. H. Bliss, a gentleman whose knowledge of history and familiarity with modern Rome render him peculiarly fitted for what is not always an easy task. And, in addition to giving facilities to foreign students, the Pope encourages (and pays for) the publication of historical works by members of his own Church. The Register of Clement V.,<sup>3</sup> the first Pope who never went to Rome, is now being edited by learned Benedictines, and the first volume has recently appeared. It only contains the first year of the Pontificate (1305 and 1306), about half the volume being taken up with *prolegomena*, in which the editor traces the history of Clement's Registers. There were fifty-three volumes at Avignon in 1369, of which some were burnt, some got to Paris, and the remainder to Rome, where they now are. The bulls and briefs are not all printed in full. A sufficient abstract of them is given, with the first words and the date, much on the principle of our "Calendars of State Papers," though of course in Latin. In beauty of printing the book far surpasses our Government publications, though in the arrangement of the matter the Italians might take a hint or two from our "Calendars." English churches and English clergymen are here and there the subjects of the briefs, but the chief interest of the Pontificate, the ruin of the Templars and the Council of Vienne, do not come within the scope of the volume.

<sup>3</sup> "Regestum Clementis Papæ V." Rome. 1885.

The indefatigable Mr. Ashton has brought out another book<sup>4</sup> on his favourite subject—the social life of a bygone day—all paste and scissors, as usual. Till the book is opened, no one would suspect how literally the title describes the contents. “Old Times” consists of very little more than cuttings from the *Times* newspaper, from its commencement in 1788 to the end of the century. The selection has been judicious, and the result is amusing, more especially as the compiler has illustrated many of the notices, especially of fashion, by sketches from caricatures by Gillray and Rowlandson. What with the difficulty of procuring news and the danger of publishing it, the *Times* gave much more space to social paragraphs, and even to scandal, than it does now; and many of Mr. Ashton’s extracts could only appear now in a “society” journal not of the highest class. Fancy an art critic in a leading daily reviewing the Academy exhibition in this tone (the picture referred to is Fuseli’s “Theseus and Ariadne,” exhibited in 1788):—“Poor Theseus, with a broken leg, is endeavouring to support Ariadne, whose figure suggests more the idea of a sick idiot than a beautiful woman. Whilst we pity the situation of these two lovers, we cannot forbear laughing at the little cock-tailed Minotaur, galloping about for amusement in the distance. The design, however, has some merit; but Theseus appears as if he had left his skin behind him, and, indeed, some of his muscles are not in their proper places.” Music and drama does not appear to have been criticized at all, but stories of ludicrous incidents on the stage abound. *Ex uno disce omnes*. “In the banquet scene, Banquo’s murderer was by some untoward accident missing, and the business of the drama was threatened with suspension, when, in the exigency of the moment, an ignorant candle-snuffer was pushed forward to tell the horrible tale. On seeing him, Macbeth, who had been motionless with confusion and embarrassment, burst from his state of torpor and exclaimed, ‘There’s blood upon thy face!’ ‘Is there, by God!’ cried the astonished clown, and, clapping his hands to his cheek with a mixture of anger and alarm, continued, ‘then that damned blunt razor has cut me again!’” In the theatrical costumes we notice that only Hamlet wears ordinary contemporary dress, with no attempt at archaism of any kind, while Hotspur and Falstaff both make some attempt, though rather lamely, at truth to history. A few years earlier, Garrick had acted Romeo in pretty much the same dress in which he walked the streets. Among the ladies’ dresses described, the waggoner’s frock has come up again recently, in consequence of its comfort and simplicity, and perhaps the petticoat will be worn round the neck again some day. This is how it was done in 1796:—“Flesh-coloured pantaloons, over which was a gauze petticoat, tucked up at each side in drapery, so that the thighs could be seen; the binding of the petticoat was tied round the neck, and her arms were through the pocket-holes. Her head-dress was a man’s pearl-coloured stocking, the foot hanging down at

<sup>4</sup> “Old Times: a Picture of Social Life at the End of the Eighteenth Century.” By John Ashton. J. C. Nimmo. 1885.

the back of the head like a lappet, and in the heel of the stocking was stuck a large diamond pin—the *tout ensemble* not less novel than ludicrous." In military dress one of the many changes is chronicled—the abolition of the full-dress coat for officers in line regiments in favour of a short coat, without lace or lappels. This alteration, according to the *Times*, displeased many of the "sucking colonels," for in those days boys at school were often presented with commissions. "They say they feel as if they were going to be flogged." While the army was officered in this disgraceful way, the method of recruiting was still more shameful. Recruiting sergeants and their agents were not averse to kidnapping when they could not get volunteers, and even had recourse to the shameful expedient of having "women of the town genteelly dressed up for the purpose of inveigling young men into their houses, which they styled their lodgings, when the deluded were instantly handcuffed, and about three or four o'clock in the morning sent off in coaches hired for the purpose to the country." To the praise of the civil magistrates, be it said, that when cases of this kind came before them the captives were generally set at liberty. One case is recorded where a wife, obtaining permission to see her husband in the House of Correction before his being sent on board the fleet, cut off his finger and thumb with a chisel and mallet, to render him unfit for service. It was a wonder men obtained in such a way were of any use; but, after the first shock was over, they generally set to work with a will, fear of punishment and emulation being strong incentives. How few people who have their *Times* for an hour in the morning know that lending newspapers was once illegal, and subject to a penalty of £5, as a fraud upon the revenue! These are by no means all the subjects which "Old Times" touches on, but this is enough to show that the book will afford amusement for many an odd half-hour. And we will end with one more story about the time when English people were divided into two camps about the French Revolution:—"Dr. Priestley gave 'the *sans culottes* of England' at a dinner party. A clergyman of the Church of England, willing to get rid of politics, archly exclaimed, 'Yes, with all my heart; I presume you mean the single ladies, for the married ones generally wear the breeches.' The wit being called on in his turn, Dr. Priestley desired the president to be on his guard, for he saw plainly that the clergyman, if presented with an inch, would take an ell. 'Thank you for the hint, doctor,' replied the clerical humorist; 'yes, I'll take three ells—so here's Liberty, Loyalty, and Lawn Sleeves.' The room, of course, was in a roar, and the doctor, quite shocked, went off like lightning without a conductor." We need hardly say that the jokes are emphasized by the constant use of capitals and italics, which look so absurd in *Punch's* imitation of "Tom and Jerry."

Mr. Lecky, in his "History of England," dates the birth of English Radicalism in 1769, the year of Wilkes' re-election for Middlesex, but Mr. Harris, in his "History of the Radical Party,"<sup>5</sup> takes exception to

<sup>5</sup> "The History of the Radical Party in Parliament." By William Harris. Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1885.

this, and ascribes the remark to a misconception of the writer in considering that it was a novel idea, characteristic of the party, that outside opinion ought to influence parliamentary action. The salutary effect, and even necessity, of external pressure was strongly urged even by Burke, who had not much of the Radical about him. Mr. Harris apparently considers that the distinctive work of a Radical, as opposed to a Whig or Liberal, is the attaching greater importance to the method in which the Legislature is elected than to the quality of the laws which they pass. He therefore cannot consider the party so old by some fifty years, and is inclined to place its birth at the Parliament of 1819, when first the word *Whig* ceased to be synonymous with *Liberal*. Since that date Radical opinions, the desire "to widen and improve political institutions and to increase the social, the intellectual, and the political liberties of the people," have exercised more and more influence on legislation; but Mr. Harris does not point out, and perhaps hardly realizes, that Radicalism, like any other "ism," as it gains strength, is in danger of becoming intolerant. Where old-fashioned Radicals would have said, "Let every man do as he like so long as he does not hurt his neighbour," modern Radicals are too apt to consider legislation a panacea for every evil, and to say, "The majority think this right, therefore every one must do it." Mr. Harris is a thorough politician, and considers "the conflict of opinions the sign of real national life." But is not "the stagnation of domestic policy" the time when men are free to give their minds and their time to commerce, to improvements in arts and manufactures, and other matters which benefit the whole community as much as any alteration in the method by which the 600 gentlemen who sit in the House of Commons are elected can possibly do? This "conflict of opinions" began in 1865, and "could end only in one of two ways, either in the victory of Radical principles, or in national weakness and decay." Which Mr. Harris thinks has been the result he does not distinctly say, but, while Radical principles have gained ground, they have not prevented agricultural depression, which is turning large tracts of the country from arable land to permanent grass, as no farmer can live on them; they have not prevented a stagnation in trade and manufacture, of which commercial men are constantly complaining; nor have they prevented the waste of the lives and money of Englishmen in wars which only a small minority affect to consider just and expedient. The book is very fairly and impartially written—a difficult thing on such a subject, and therefore the more praiseworthy. It is amusing, however, to see a want of conscientiousness in politics ascribed as a special attribute of Conservative Ministers when the action of Liberal members last year in the case of Female Suffrage can hardly yet be forgotten.

When the Count von Moltke was a young lieutenant, more than fifty years ago, his duties in the Topographical Department of the Prussian War Office took him to Silesia and Posen, and, being a man of an active mind, he used his spare time in studying the history of Poland. The result was an essay, published in 1832, which, scarcely noticed at

the time, was recently rediscovered by Dr. G. Karpeles, republished in Germany, and translated in England.<sup>6</sup> It is very good as far as it goes, rather like a carefully got up prize essay by an undergraduate, but without the references which undergraduates generally are particular in inserting to satisfy querulous examiners. The peculiar Constitution of Poland is clearly and succinctly explained. A body of nobles, all with perfectly equal political rights, whether lords of many acres or mere swashbucklers, any one of whom could stop all legislation by the utterance of the fatal *nie pozwalam* (I do not consent), with a king over them who could not depose any of the men he had appointed to high offices,—it was the principle of “the Man versus the State” carried to a *reductio ad absurdum*. And this right of the individual to stop all progress was tempered only by the right of his opponents to appeal to force, either on the spot, or by forming a *wokosz* (conspiracy), the members of which bound themselves to take up arms in support of their opinions. At every vacancy in the Crown the nobles handed it to the successor with somewhat diminished rights and powers, and (here we see the views of a German military man) “among the chief causes of the fall of the republic was the continual decrease of the royal power in the State.” This is true, if it is possible that a strong king could or would have diminished the privileges of the nobles, and have laid the foundations for a prosperous middle class, either by raising and freeing the peasants or by wearing down the absurd restriction by which the poorest noble, even if a domestic servant, whose faults were punished by the lash (with a carpet under his knees out of respect for his pedigree) forfeited his rights if he adopted any commercial occupation. In the middle and later ages the only middle class were Jews, whose power and influence were nearly equal to that of the nobles, and who had a diet and marshal of their own. For centuries they managed to evade the payment of all taxes, and when at last a poll-tax of a florin was imposed, it only brought in a sum of 16,000 florins for a population of 200,000. The Count ends with a *couleur de rose* description of the establishment of peasant proprietors, foundation of schools, and other improvements in Posen. “Such laws could only be carried out under the rule of a stable, highly developed State like Prussia, if the land was to be saved from revolution and violent reactions.”

*Laus vilissima quando quis laudatur ab ipso.*

The second volume of Mr. Egmont Hake's *Life of General Gordon*<sup>7</sup>, is devoted principally to a defence of his actions in the Soudan, and accusations against the present Government for not doing as he thought best. This defence is not always very intelligible. It may be true that the General's proclamation authorizing slavery in the Soudan was “a brilliant diplomatic conception,” and no doubt it

<sup>6</sup> “Poland: an Historical Sketch.” By Field Marshal Count von Moltke. Translated by Emma S. Buchheim. Chapman & Hall.

<sup>7</sup> “The Story of Chinese Gordon.” By A. Egmont Hake. Remington & Co. 1885.

enabled Gordon to win Khartoum—that is, to win those men whose position was based upon the horrid traffic in “black ivory;” but then it did not require a man of Gordon’s character and abilities to go to Khartoum and leave the country in as bad a state as he found it. As to his desire for the employment of Zebehr, it is probable that he knew better than any one in England how the country could best be governed. Mr. Hake says: “As the Master whom he served first struck down His enemy Saul and then converted him into His faithful servant Paul, so Gordon struck down his enemies and used them as allies after changing them into friends. He had destroyed Zebehr’s power as a slavehunter, and the power of those who helped him; he now urged that the employment of such power as he still possessed should be directed into a new channel. . . . Zebehr would never make an honest Governor-General of the Soudan, in the Western acceptation of the term. He would never tell the truth, for the truth is not in him; and he would always take bribes and extort them if they were not offered. Lies and bribes are national attributes, and a native Governor-General who did without them would be regarded as a fool. But Zebehr, notwithstanding all this, might prove an abler and more useful ruler of the Soudan than, with one exception, the Soudan has yet known, for he knows the people whom he would be called upon to govern, and by them he is known and feared.” This is a sample of Mr. Hake’s cooler reasoning. In his less-restrained moods he compares Wolseley’s expedition to Mark Twain’s blue jay who dropped innumerable acorns through a knot-hole in the roof of a log-house, under the impression that he was making himself a hoard in a safe place of deposit; and talks of Mr. Gladstone, “who to many people was as plainly responsible for Gordon’s death as Faragh himself,” “playing with statesmanship, and paving with good intentions as much of hell as, after fifty years of active political life, he had still left unrepaired.” These be brave words, but more facts about Gordon and less of Mr. Hake’s opinions would have better suited most readers.

The religious side of Gordon’s character is shown in a little book brought out by a clergyman whom he happened to meet at Lausanne, and with whom he became very intimate.<sup>8</sup> His views of the intimacy of the relation which ought to exist between man and God were expressed in terms closely allied to the words of the mediæval mystics: “As we have need of God, he would say, so God has need of us; and He created mankind in order that He might have a dwelling-place in the body—in the heart and conscience.” How a man with such views could belong to a profession of which the object is the destruction of the “temples of the living God” is not explained, and perhaps cannot be; but then, if every one was consistent, the world would be very dull.

It was this religious fervour which caused Gordon to be considered by the Arabs as the incarnation of evil and error, as the Antichrist

<sup>8</sup> “Charles George Gordon: a Sketch.” By R. H. Barnes, Vicar of Heavertree, and Major C. E. Brown. Macmillan & Co. 1885.

whom the Mahdi was fated to destroy; though it is possible that if he had consented to become a convert to Islamism, as it is said the Mahdi proposed to him, he might have taken upon him the rôle of Jesus Christ himself, for, theoretically at least, there can be no Mahdi without a Jesus at his side. "No one," says Prof. Darmesteter,<sup>9</sup> "has hitherto been engaged for this part, but possibly the ambition of M. Olivier Pain may be tempted by it." Mahdis (the word means, not a Leader, but One who is led—i.e., by God) are common to all Mohammedan nations. Mohammed the son of Ali is hidden in the Valley of Radwa, like Arthur in the Isle of Avalon. Some two centuries ago the son of a Kurdistan Sheikh, taking advantage of the appearance of a Jewish Messiah at Smyrna, which must, according to Mussulman ideas, precede the advent of the Mahdi, announced himself as the Mahdi; but, being captured by Turkish troops, renounced his pretensions, as did his rival. Sultan Mohammed IV. had the singular honour of being served by Antichrist as porter and by the Mahdi as valet. Three years ago a Mahdi was expected at Mecca, but the vigilance of the Turkish police prevented his appearance. Ahmed Mohammed, the present holder of the title, fulfils the necessary conditions more nearly than some others have done; for, though no Jewish Messiah has openly appeared, reports of his appearance have been rife in Arabia, and many Israelite families have journeyed to Jerusalem to find nothing but disappointment. As to the future, M. Darmesteter thinks that the fated seven years, of which half have already expired, may wear out the Mahdi, for only victories can support his pretensions. That European civilization should reach the Soudan through Egypt he considers now impossible. It must come from the West, from Abyssinia. "One day, if we wish, and will undertake the education of this infant people, the mountains of Abyssinia will be the stronghold whence European civilization shall dominate the Soudan. This is not an affair of conquest nor of annexation. It will not be necessary to lead an Abyssinian army to the conquest of Khartoum. It is a matter of slow and disinterested action, which cannot awaken jealousy, for all the nations of Europe can participate in it to the extent in which each inspires confidence."

Professor Masson<sup>10</sup> is very angry with Mr. Froude, not only for printing personal matters and remarks on private persons in his biography of Carlyle, but still more for writing "in a mood too uniformly like that of a man driving a hearse." But is that Mr. Froude's fault, or that of his subject? Even if, as Prof. Masson says, a most cruelly thoughtless remark to his sick wife was remembered by her afterwards with "a sense of the pure fun of the thing," can any one be blamed for missing the fun and seeing only the cruelty; and is not the fact that a wife has to look upon such conduct as fun the saddest part of

<sup>9</sup> "The Mahdi Past and Present." By Prof. Darmesteter. T. Fisher Unwin. 1885.

<sup>10</sup> "Carlyle, Personally and in his Writings." By David Masson. Macmillan & Co. 1885.

the whole business? Worshippers do not like to be reminded of the clay feet of their golden image, but it is better even for them to see "the fact of things," and to acknowledge it. In his remarks on Carlyle's creed the professor is not so apologetic. He attempts, as far as a lecture will allow, to discriminate between those asseverations of the "Chelsea Prophet" which he felt to be necessary and structural faiths of the human spirit, and others which were mere expressions of prejudice, and he points out the weak part in his character as a teacher, that while caring a great deal for the good of humanity, he gave little heed to any specific practical problems. The lectures were well worth reprinting and are well worth buying by any collector of "Carlyleana."

The amusing life of Madame Buonaparte, *née* Elizabeth Patterson,<sup>11</sup> which Mr. Didier published immediately after her death at Baltimore in 1879, has just been translated into French. It says a great deal for the merit of her epistolary style, and also for the translation, that many of her letters read as if they had been written originally in that language. But then Americans have a keenness of mind, a quickness of appreciation, which savours far more of France than of England. This may come from the effect of a drier climate on the nerves; it may be that the conditions of a new country, or the infusion of new blood, has modified British dulness. Whatever the cause, it is very apparent, and consequently Americans generally find themselves so much more at home on the Continent than in England, as did the lady in question.

We have laid down the Memoir of Count Giuseppe Pasolini,<sup>12</sup> one of the best of Italy's sons, with a feeling of deep respect for the man, with much sympathy, indeed, for the affectionate veneration which led his own son, the compiler of this interesting record, to undertake the task. Possibly the name of Count Pasolini is unfamiliar to the bulk of the English reading public, but it is to be hoped that they will not on that account miss the opportunity now afforded them by Lady Dalhousie's translation of becoming acquainted with the particulars of his character and career. His character was in many respects singularly strong, amiable and attractive, and his career, connected as it was with the development of constitutional liberty and unity in Italy, gives him a prominence which amply justifies a detailed account of it. Strongly disposed by natural inclination to a studious retirement, to the quiet occupations of a country gentleman as they are understood in England, and to the cultivation of domestic happiness, he was yet induced at an early age to assume the cares and responsibilities of public life. No doubt, in the stirring times which were approaching in his country's history, it would have been impossible for him to hold aloof from politics, but it was the circumstance of a friendship formed with Pope Pius IX. when that amiable Pontiff was as yet as Cardinal

<sup>11</sup> "La Vie et les Lettres de Madame Buonaparte." Paris: Paul Ollendorff. 1885.

<sup>12</sup> "Memoir of Count Giuseppe Pasolini, late President of the Senate of Italy." Compiled by his Son. Translated and abridged by the Dowager Countess of Dalhousie. Longmans, Green & Co. 1885.



Mastai zealously administering his bishopric of Imola, which led to his introduction to political life. He was summoned to Rome to assist the Pope with his advice in the institution of the reforms which marked the beginning of his reign, "in the days of bright and ever-increasing hope, when the mild words and the serene and majestic countenance of Pio Nono seemed a happy augury of good times to come." It was not long, however, before in politics the two friends, for they were friends, pursued divergent paths, and Pasolini allied himself with, and placed his services and talents at the disposal of, the party which ultimately seated King Victor Emanuel on the throne of the kingdom of Italy. While the freedom of Venetia from Austrian tyranny was yet an unaccomplished desire merely, Pasolini twice visited France and England on political missions, and the chapters which relate the circumstances of his visits and the accounts of his conversation with Lord Palmerston and Lord John Russell will not be the least interesting parts of the memoir for English readers: but indeed the whole is well worth perusal.

The death of his second son Eneas, a young and promising cavalry officer, which was occasioned by fever contracted in Calabria when engaged in hunting down and exterminating the brigands infesting that region, was one of the heavy sorrows of Count Pasolini's closing years. The home letters of the young man, written when on this service, give lively pictures of the condition of manners and morals in this district. Among the incidents related in them there is a grim humour about this one, peculiar to itself, horrible as it is:—

A brigand named Scoglio came in disguise to a farm looking for provisions, but was arrested by the county constables, about fifty of whom were gathered together. He stood firm, recognizing some of his old comrades in robbery, to whom he appealed like Cæsar's "Et tu, Brute," then said, "I surrender," and presented his pistol to one of them. The man put out his hand to receive it, but was instantly shot dead by the prisoner, who exclaimed: "It is thus that Scoglio surrenders." Being overborne he was killed on the spot by his captors, who cut off his head and stuck it upon a pole covered with a cloth. Almost immediately after they met a woman on horseback, who said: "I am Scoglio's mother, and I want to speak to him." "We have killed and beheaded him." "Show me his head." They did so. The mother recognized it as that of her son, saying: "Good God, I thank thee, for having delivered me from this torment," and then turned away to go home, quite pleased.

Why is it that compilers of historical outlines are so fond of strings of adjectives? According to Mr. Sanderson,<sup>13</sup> the latest writer of this kind of book, Philip II. of Spain was "perfidious, patient, plotting, subtle, selfish, gloomy, ignorant, cunning, and cruel," while his father, Charles V., was "silent, self-contained, patient, prudent, and subtle," and a similar "derangement of epitaphs" is applied to many other kings and emperors who played their part on the world's stage. It is difficult, perhaps, considering the necessity of compression, to say enough of a man's deeds to show his character; but phrases of the

<sup>13</sup> "Outlines of the World's History." By Edgar Sanderson, M.A. Blackie & Son. 1885.

kind referred to remind one, almost with a comic effect, of the Pinnock's Catechism of one's childhood. The advantage of such works is that they show where the histories of different countries touch each other—a thing that boys and girls are very slow to learn. And Mr. Sanderson's surpasses most of its predecessors in usefulness, because it lays more stress "on the contributions made by the chief peoples of the world to the common stock of civilization," than on the deeds of kings and queens and statesmen.

Another added to the long list of History Story-books for Children.<sup>14</sup> This last, one of Blackwood's Educational Series, is pleasantly written, and the stories are well selected, but there is no special characteristic to distinguish it from its fellows. A little more pains might with advantage have been bestowed upon the illustrations, for children value such things, and have better taste than some of their elders suppose. Correctness, too, ought to be studied. A Roundhead trooper is rather out of place at the battle of Poitiers, and even a child can see the carelessness which allows a picture of the burial of Sir John Moore on the beach at Corunna to accompany a statement that he was interred on the ramparts.

"The Liberty of Independent Historical Research."<sup>15</sup> This is a high-sounding title, with a flavour of John Milton about it. And what has raised Mr. Kerslake's wrath? Simply that the new Inspector of Ancient Monuments, in his official account of excavations in the Pen Pits, near Penselwood, Somerset, disagrees with the theory Mr. Kerslake has advocated with considerable iteration, that these pits mark the site of a British town, and asserts that they can be nothing more than quarries for flints. Not having the report before us, it is not fair to express an opinion as to which has the best of the argument; but whenever Government meddles with science, there is danger of a tone of authority being employed as a substitute for reasoning.

The opponents of endowments for religious or educational purposes will find more stones for their slings on the other side of the Atlantic than might have been supposed in a free and enlightened republic.<sup>16</sup> The original scheme for supporting schools in North-Western America was a practical and simple one, and might have been expected to work well. Just a hundred years ago it was enacted by Congress that in new States a lot in every township should be reserved for the maintenance of public schools. Unluckily the object of the grant was far more to attract settlers than to promote education, and application for further grants after the States were once admitted to the Union were almost invariably refused. The land was disposed of in various ways—generally wasteful, sometimes sold on perpetually renewable leases, which could not be altered in favour of the State, but only of the lessee; sometimes leased with power to the lessee to take a deed

<sup>14</sup> "Short Stories from the History of England." Blackwood & Sons. 1885.

<sup>15</sup> "The Liberty of Independent Historical Research." By Thos. Kerslake. Reeves & Turner. 1885.

<sup>16</sup> "American Historical Association." Vol. I., No. 3 Putnam's Sons. 1886.

in fee on payment of the last appraised value, perhaps fifteen or twenty years before; often sold at unfavourable times for a mere trifle. Then in spite of the good bargain the purchasers had made, in some places, Michigan for instance, they got a reduction of their rent by dint of constantly petitioning the legislature. The result was that before many years, in one State forty million dollars had "disappeared from view, and the State officials seem unable to locate it," and in some counties "the whole fund has been totally and irretrievably lost." In Ohio the money for the lands was lent to the State, spent, and the interest paid by taxation, so that at the present time the burden of supporting the schools is nowise lighter than it would have been without any grant. The States have seen their errors and are trying to rectify them; but meanwhile the colleges and universities, for which the people care less than for primary schools, have lost nearly all their endowments, and the States not infrequently refuse to help them. These remarks are based on a very able paper by Dr. Knight, a doctoral thesis in fact, which he read before the American Historical Association at its first public meeting last year. A society which can command papers of such merit deserves congratulation.

In the proceedings of the Royal Historical Society<sup>17</sup> there is an instructive paper by Sir F. J. Goldsmid on the perplexities of Oriental History, which is applicable to other histories besides that of the East. He speaks of the difficulties of presenting the chief actors, even such well-known personages as Timur, in a sufficiently lifelike way to interest the English public. Even his personal appearance is the subject of the most conflicting statements, the sifting of which is a bore to most readers. There is no doubt that the most captivating histories are those in which the writer seems to have no hesitation, but to describe what he sees passing before him. This, unless merely "cocksureness," can only be the result of long and hard work, which has a tendency to show too much, like the stitches in tapestry; and so Sir F. Goldsmid's advice is, to use an attractive style and throw all extracts, discussion of contradictory statements, and such like into an appendix. The latter part, any one can follow. The attractive style is not so easily adopted.

Mr. Oscar Browning contributes to the same number a careful discussion of the treaty of commerce between England and France in 1786.

---

<sup>17</sup> "Transactions of the Royal Historical Society." Vol. II. Part IV. Longmans, Green & Co. 1885.

## BELLES LETTRES.

IT is generally held that obscurity in a poet is a mark of inferiority, that the best poets express their thoughts intelligibly, and avoid far-fetched images and intricate word puzzles. Against this it may be urged that great poets are at times obscure, and that profound ideas can only be made intelligible by the aid of subtlety both of style and thought. There is, however, a kind of obscurity which is altogether provoking, and which arises neither from the profundity of the thought, nor from any logical necessity, but rather from a trifling and an affectation on the part of the writers. With a plain tale to tell they will not deliver themselves of it straightway, but doling it out in dribblets, they seem to imagine that the essence of poetic narrative is to leave the reader to find out for himself what it is all about. Like children, they could tell an they would, but they have no intention of parting with their little mystery until they have driven their victims beside themselves with protracted guessing. We have before us a volume of poems bearing the honoured name of Miss Jean Ingelow,<sup>1</sup> and remembering the delight which her earlier verses gave us we opened her new volume with pleased expectation. We confess to have been disappointed. These poems are full of pure and noble sentiment, and at times the rhythm has that peculiar catch which at once raised Miss Ingelow's verse to a position of its own, but the broken character of the narrative and the allusiveness of style, provoke us to impatience. "The Bell Bird," "The Sleep of Sigismund," and in a less degree "The Maid Martyr," require very careful reading indeed before the motive of the piece becomes apparent. And in the meantime the patience of the reader is exhausted. Even in "Echo and the Ferry," which reproduces much of the old charm, the thread of narrative slips every now and then from our grasp. It is from this poem that we select the following lines, which are sure to please our readers:—

But this was the country—perhaps it was close under heaven.  
 Oh, nothing so likely ; the voice might have come from it even.  
 I knew about heaven ; but this was the country, of this  
 Light blossom, and piping and flashing of wings not at all.  
 Not at all ! No. But one little bird was an easy forgiver ;  
 She peeped ; she drew near as I moved from her domicile small,  
 Then flashed down her hole like a dart—like a dart from the quiver.  
 And I waded atween the long grasses and felt it was bliss.

"Louise de la Vallière, and other Poems,"<sup>2</sup> by Katherine Tynan, are removed *longo intervallo* from those of Miss Ingelow. Full of the words and phrases of the modern muse they will satisfy those, and those only, who walk in the footsteps of Dante Gabriel Rossetti and

<sup>1</sup> "Poems." By Jean Ingelow. Third Series. London : Longmans, Green & Co. 1885.

<sup>2</sup> "Louise de la Vallière, and other Poems." By Katherine Tynan. London : Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., Paternoster Square. 1885.

his school. It would be unfair to say that they are full of sound without sense, but undoubtedly the sense exists for the sake of the sound. Too much is trusted to catch-words, which after a time fail to evoke the expected association. We are out of conceit with "languorous," and "odorous," and "leprous"—with "auroral," "passionate," and the like; and when it comes to apostrophising Charles Lamb as "Dear Heart," our patience fairly breaks down. No doubt to every age and to every writer we must allow a choice of style, but in no way can verse writers more readily deceive themselves with the idea that they are creating music, than by a contented and unblushing employment of words and phrases which are beyond their compass. In short, the minor poet should lay to heart the maxim that "who drives fat oxen should himself be fat." Little as we sympathize with the sentiment we prefer to most of the other pieces the "Lines to a Dead Patriot."

In a strange preface, which is perhaps intended to be humorous, and is therefore liable to be misunderstood by the denser brain of the Briton, Mr. Adair Welcker<sup>3</sup> informs us that "by a strange unanimity of opinion they (his plays) have been pronounced to be made of the same material as the writing of the greatest of dramatists." Does he mean to tell us that he writes like Shakespeare? If so, he should have particularized. He certainly does write plays in blank verse—very fair blank verse indeed—and not seldom he borrows situations from Shakespeare, and in so doing produces a more or less ghastly parody of Shakespeare. Not, however, in dramatic interest nor in play of character does Mr. Welcker excel; and we would advise him to put Shakespeare out of his head, and, trusting to the facility of style which he undoubtedly possesses, restrict himself to poetic narrative. We note in "Romer, King of Norway"<sup>4</sup> some curious slips: "Somewhere way up there among the stars," "Who do you love?" and on page 201 the following comical misprint: "Why death and blood! you trembling wrinkled villian!"

In an "Irish Garland"<sup>5</sup> Mrs. Piatt displays more concern as to the manner than the matter of her verse. A passing fancy, a pathetic remembrance, serves for the occasion of a poem; and then comes the serious task of putting it into shape. Happily we are spared the infliction of hackneyed archaisms, but for all that we do not get a plain story. Sometimes the author speaks, sometimes an invisible interlocutor bursts into conversation; and so with broken allusions, parenthesis, and the alternation of colloquial and poetic phraseology, at length the dish is served. To speak the truth, the pathos is genuine enough, but the style is full of affectation.

We are not sure that we understand the point or drift of "The Sage of Thebes."<sup>6</sup> The language is clear, and the verse is ringing and

<sup>3</sup> "Romer, King of Norway, and other Dramas." By Adair Welcker. (Copyright. 1885.) Sacramento: Press of Lewis & Johnstone. 1885.

<sup>4</sup> "An Irish Garland." By Mrs. S. M. B. Piatt. Edinburgh: David Douglas. 1884.

<sup>5</sup> "The Sage of Thebes." By George Eyre. London: Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row, E.C.

musical, but the narrative is confused and lacks coherence. The idea of the opening scene—the student dissatisfied with immaterial joys—is borrowed from “Faust;” but of this poem, as of so many that come under our notice, it may be said that the author declines to part with the clue.

“The Children Out of Doors: a Book of Verses,”<sup>6</sup> though published in Edinburgh, must have had its birth across the Atlantic. Sympathy with the poor and outcast, especially poor children, suggest the pathos, which is tender and genuine. Some lines on “The Thought of Astyanax beside Iulus” rise to a higher level.

It is a pleasure to turn from the consideration of works which, for the most part, are suited only for private circulation to literary composition of a very high order. In his translation of the “Odyssey” Mr. Way attained success, and he now presents us with the First Six Books of the “Iliad”<sup>7</sup> translated into a long ballad measure. For the mere pleasure of reading, we confess that we prefer Lord Derby’s blank verse, and as an original composition, Chapman’s version must of course have the pre-eminence; but as an accurate presentation of the original in a poetical form which retains not a little of the roll and lilt of the Greek hexameters, Mr. Way’s new translation more than holds its own. If the “Iliad” is to be done into English at all, it should be done into verse; for, unlike the “Odyssey,” the form and sound are of its essence. We select for quotation the passage in the Third Book which describes the foregathering of Helen with the Old Man on the tower:—

So spake they, but Priam uplifted his voice, and to Helen he cried :  
 “Hither come to the fort, dear child, sit down by the old man’s side,  
 And so shalt thou look on thine husband of old, on thy friends and thy kin.  
 Nay, nay ! ’tis the gods have done it ; not thine I account the sin,  
 For they brought up against me Achaia, the war, and the tears, and the grief,  
 And shalt tell me of yonder captain, and name that battle chief;  
 That hero amidst the Achaians, stalwart and great to see.”

\* \* \* \* \*

And Helen, the woman divine, made answer to him and she said :  
 “Honoured art thou in mine eyes, dear sire of my lord, and dread.  
 Oh, had I chosen but death, yea, an evil death in the hour  
 When I followed thy son, and forsook mine acquaintance, my bridal bower,  
 And my daughter, my best beloved, and the sweet girls, playmates mine !  
 Woe’s me ! it was not to be, and for this do I weep and pine.  
 But this will I tell thee whereof thou enquirest and askest of me,  
 Atreus’ son Agamemnon, the wide-dominioned is he,  
 A noble king, and withal a spearman battle-keen,  
 And was brother to shameless me—yea, this strange thing hath been ! ”

We have also to commend, both for faithfulness to the original and for dignity and sobriety of style, the translation of Schiller’s “Wallen-

<sup>6</sup> “The Children Out of Doors: a Book of Verses.” By Two in One House. Edinburgh: David Douglas. 1884.

<sup>7</sup> “The Iliad of Homer,” done into English Verse by Arthur S. Way, M.A., Head Master of Wesley College, Melbourne. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington, Crown Buildings, 188, Fleet Street. 1885.

stein,"<sup>8</sup> by Mr. J. A. W. Hunter. Coleridge, who translated from the "Piccolomini" and the "Death of Wallenstein" from Schiller's MS., omitted the first portion of the trilogy, Wallenstein's camp, on the ground of the impossibility of reproducing the rhythm of the original, and for other reasons. Mr. Hunter's version of the first part is spirited and reads but little like a translation. The addition will be greatly appreciated by English readers. We do not suppose that Mr. Hunter claims to approach Schiller as a poet and an equal, but he has certainly given us a translation which may be read with pleasure for its own sake. An historical Introduction forms an excellent preface to an historical drama. It is luminous, concise, and highly instructive.

Some insight into the character of modern Greek verse may be obtained from a translation of Greek Lays,<sup>9</sup> by Mr. E. M. Edmonds. A brief Introduction supplies the reader with an account of the War of Independence and of the causes which led up to it. The translations are of unequal merit, some having all the harshness of a literal rendering, and others being musical in themselves. As a translation one of the most successful is "The Star," by John Karasutsas. In the Legendary Poems and Folk Songs, the gentle naïveté and imaginative humour remind us now and again of Heine. We give the following lines—"To a Diamond"—from *Ἰστοὶ Ἀρχαῖαι*.

It once so happed a crystal fragment lay,  
Unmarkèd long upon some thistles sere,  
When on a sudden, kissed by the sun's ray,  
Its brilliant sparkling all behold, and say :  
"Ha, what a lovely diamond is here!"  
My love it is, that clotheth her with light,  
For all she is a maiden, no more fair  
Than others, but for me—a star of night ;  
A flower, an angel, or a bird o' the air !  
For you 'tis glass ; for me a diamond bright.

"The Plays performed by the Crafts, or Mysteries of York, on the Day of Corpus Christi, in the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries, now first published from the unique Manuscript in the Library of Lord Ashburnham, Edited, with Introduction and Glossary, by Lucy Toulmin Smith,"<sup>10</sup> is the full title of a laborious and valuable work which has been issued by the Clarendon Press. In her able Introduction the editor gives a history of the MS., so far as can be traced, from the time that it fell into the hands of the Fairfax family, of whom some sat on the "Council of the North" until it passed into the possession of the late Lord Ashburnham. It is worth recording that Horace Walpole bought the MS. for a guinea, and that at his sale it fetched £220 10s. We learn from the Introduction that the Mystery Plays

<sup>8</sup> "Wallenstein : a Drama." By Friedrich Schiller. Done into English Verse by J. A. W. Hunter, B.A. Cantab. London : Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., Paternoster Square. 1885.

<sup>9</sup> "Greek Lays, Idylls, Legends," &c. Translated by E. M. Edmonds. With Introduction and Notes. London : Trübner & Co., Ludgate Hill. 1885.

<sup>10</sup> "York Mystery Plays." Edited by L. Toulmin Smith. Oxford : at the Clarendon Press. 1885.

were put on the stage at the expense of the various guilds—armourers, bakers, spurriers, lorimers, and the like. The probable date of the MS. is 1430–40, and the date of composition is about a hundred years earlier. The author may be assumed to have been a member of one of the northern religious houses. The plays are written in rhymed stanzas, in which the metre is determined sometimes by accent or stress, and sometimes by a fixed number of syllables. Appendices to the introduction contain lists of places where the Mystery Plays were performed, lists of crafts and explanation of names, and notes to the dialect and grammar. The book is beautifully printed, and thanks are due to the editor and the Clarendon Press for so valuable an addition to middle English literature. Three plates give facsimiles of various parts of the manuscript.

“*Ros Rosarum ex Horto Poetarum*”<sup>11</sup> is essentially a “dainty volume.” From poets of many tongues and all ages, E. V. B. has culled passages or short lyrics written about or in praise of the Queen of Flowers. She prefaces her selection with a quaint and graceful Epistle to the Reader, and to her delicate pencil we owe sundry vignettes and illustrations. Need we say that type and paper are all that might be expected from the Chiswick Press, and that the binding is of loose white parchment? “*Ros Rosarum*” is due to a happy conceit, and no pains have been spared to make the garland of roses an enchanted circle. Only one thought appals us. Is it the first of a series?

Mr. T. Ashe, whose edition of Coleridge’s “*Lectures and Notes on Shakespeare*” was noticed in *THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW* of April, 1884, issues an edition of the Poems,<sup>12</sup> not including the dramatic works, in two volumes. He gives us, by way of introduction, a careful revision of the events of Coleridge’s life, and an essay on the bibliography of the poems. The biographical memoir may be regarded as supplementary to those of Mr. Basil Montague Pickering and Mr. Trail. We observe that he takes the apologetic view in the much-voiced controversy as to Coleridge’s life and character. On the other hand, he is disposed to represent Southey in a somewhat less favourable light than those who have hitherto exalted him at the expense of his brother poet. We hold that a defence of Coleridge is practicable without any corresponding detraction from the beauty and nobility of Southey’s character. Whatever the relations between the brothers-in-law may have been as to money matters, the generosity of Southey is beyond all question. But no doubt on this subject, as on others where Coleridge is concerned, hostile criticism has gone astray, and Mr. Ashe is doing good service in rescuing a great name from idle and unmerited calumny. In his arrangement of the poems, Mr. Ashe follows to some extent the edition of 1884,

<sup>11</sup> “*Ros Rosarum ex Horto Poetarum.*” By E. V. B. London: Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row, E.C. 1885.

<sup>12</sup> “*The Poetical Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge.*” Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by T. Ashe, B.A., Cambridge. In two vols. London: George Bell & Sons, York Street, Covent Garden. 1886.



and in part adopts an arrangement of his own. We prefer the chronological arrangement of Mr. B. M. Pickering's edition of 1877. With some of Mr. Ashe's critical remarks we are not in accord. He considers the "Lines to a Young Ass" to have been written by Coleridge as a parody of the verses of a friend, but they are undoubtedly intended to be serious. Again, in the beautiful lines

'Twas partly love, and partly fear,  
And partly 'twas a bashful art,  
That I might rather feel than see  
The swelling of her heart,

he detects, incredible as it may seem, a want of delicacy. To the famous epitaph beginning "Stop, Christian passer-by—stop, child of God," he appends the note:—"The endlessly recurring and feeble pleasantry of the initials was never more ill-timed." We should have said that it was never more appropriate. In Part III. of "The Ancient Mariner" a curious omission occurs. Mr. Ashe, following Pickering's edition of 1828, reads, "The game is done! I've, I've won!" But in Moxon's edition of 1852, and B. M. Pickering's of 1877, the line is given thus: "The game is done! I've, won! I've won!" Surely there can be no doubt as to the correctness of the latter reading.

An edition of Gray, with Notes and Introduction, by Mr. Edmund Gosse,<sup>13</sup> issued by the Clarendon Press, reminds us that to Gray, as well as to Coleridge, have posthumous honours ("the storied urn and animated bust") been paid within the last few weeks. Both were profound and subtle critics, both were lovers of mountain scenery; but how great a contrast was the life of the elder poet, who "kept the noiseless tenor of his way," to his, the wanderer and exile, who "here found death in life"! The Life in the volume before us is an abbreviation of that published in the series known as "English Men of Letters," and the notes are taken from Mr. Gosse's larger edition, in four volumes, of Gray's works, published by Macmillan in 1884. This little edition is a model of excellence, both as to extent and accuracy of information conveyed in the Life, and the temper and style of criticism. Mr. Gosse speaks in natural tones, and not in that patronizing falsetto which the modern biographer takes so much pains to assume.

To their series of selected plays, the Clarendon Press add "Twelfth Night; or, What you Will."<sup>14</sup> The Notes and Preface are by Mr. W. Aldis Wright. The origin of the plot is traced by Mr. Wright to an Italian play, "Gl'Ingannati, or the Deceived," which is itself founded on a story told by Bandello in his "Novelle." Shakespeare probably made use of some forgotten adaptation or translation. Lamb's criticism on Malvolio is quoted at length, and a proposed new division of the acts, by Mr. James Spedding, is taken from the "Transactions" of the New Shakespeare Society. The editing of these scholarly manuals for students has been raised to a fine art.

<sup>13</sup> "Gray: Selected Poems." Edited by Edmund Gosse. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

<sup>14</sup> Shakespeare: Select Plays, "Twelfth Night." Edited by William Aldis Wright, M.A. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1885.

Messrs. Ginn, Heath & Co. add to their classics for children "The Lady of the Lake,"<sup>15</sup> with a Life of Sir Walter Scott; and Lamb's "Tales from Shakespeare." The vocabulary at the end of "The Lady of the Lake" will prove useful. With abridgments of any sort, except for educational purposes, we have little sympathy. Nothing will keep the book-loving child from books, and nothing will drive the book-hating child to books. "In vain is the net spread in the sight of any bird!" By the way, the "*wickedness* of playing study" on which Mr. Ginn dilates, must be a sin of the New World.

We have to acknowledge a second edition of "Short Essays"<sup>16</sup> for the use of Indian students, by Mr. N. J. Ratnagar. They are short and to the point, and are likely to be of use for the purpose for which they are intended.

"Standard Reader,"<sup>17</sup> Book V., edited by Professor Meiklejohn, for Blackwood's Educational Series, consists of selections from such authors as Leigh Hunt, Emerson, George Eliot, and J. R. Lowell. The illustrations are excellent. Children fed on literary food so nourishing and so dainty, ought to grow up into poets and men of letters. But we do not expect that they will.

"Essays in Latin Literature,"<sup>18</sup> by Professor Nettleship, consist of lectures delivered at Oxford during the last six years, together with some Critical Miscellanies. The lectures, which are on various subjects, while they display laborious scholarship and original research, may be read with interest by the ordinary Latin student. In the Lecture on Early Italian Civilization, Professor Nettleship contends, on philological grounds, that "there was no such thing as a Græco-Italian Period, but that the civilization common to the Greek and Latin race was anterior to their separation from the Indo-German parent stock." Two lectures on the Lexicographer Verrius Flaccus, the abridgments of Festus and Paulus, and the preservation of much original matter of Flaccus in the pages of Quintilian, Pliny, Nonius, Macrobius, &c., are full of interest, and should be eagerly studied.

We have received from America an edition of the "Clouds" of Aristophanes,<sup>19</sup> with Notes and Introduction by Professor Humphries, of the University of Texas; an interleaved edition of the "Evagoras" of Isocrates,<sup>20</sup> with Notes by Mr. Henry Clarke; and "Selections for Trans-

<sup>15</sup> Scott's "Lady of the Lake." Edited by Edwin Ginn. Boston: published by Ginn, Heath & Co. 1885. "Tales from Shakespeare," by Charles and Mary Lamb. Boston: Ginn, Heath & Co. 1885.

<sup>16</sup> "Short Essays on Literary and Social Subjects for the use of Indian Students." By Nasarvanji Jamsetji Ratnagar. London: Trübner. Sold by Atmaram, Sagoon & Co., Raibadavie.

<sup>17</sup> Blackwood's "Fifth Standard Reader." Edited by Professor Meiklejohn. London and Edinburgh: William Blackwood & Sons. 1885.

<sup>18</sup> "Lectures and Essays on Latin Literature." By H. Nettleship, M.A. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1885.

<sup>19</sup> Aristophanes' "Clouds." Edited on the basis of Kock's edition. By M. W. Humphreys, Professor in the University of Texas. Boston: Ginn, Heath & Co.

<sup>20</sup> "The Evagoras of Isocrates," with Introduction. By Henry Clarke, M.A. London: W. Swan Sonnenschein & Co., Paternoster Square. 1885.

lation at Sight from the Greek,"<sup>21</sup> by Professor Kendrick, of Yale. Messrs Macmillan add to their classical series the "Epistles" and "Ars Poetica" of Horace,<sup>22</sup> with Notes and Prefatory Introduction on the Date, Composition, and Text of the Epistles, by Mr. A. S. Wilkins. The same firm issue Part I. of "Exercises in Latin Composition,"<sup>23</sup> wholly based on Cæsarian Prose, with Notes and Appendix, by Mr. F. P. Simpson. Mr. Simpson's method is to take the words and phrases of a series of chapters in Cæsar's "De Bello Gallico," and to construct out of these a passage of English prose for translation into Latin. We have also to notice "A Lexicon of Parallel Passages,"<sup>24</sup> in which two or more words occur in the same order in the "Iliad" and "Odyssey" of Homer. The capital letters refer to the Book of the "Iliad," the small type to those of the "Odyssey."

"Common Sense French,"<sup>25</sup> by Messrs. H. Pooley and K. Carnie, seems to us a most useful little book, designed on an admirable plan. We agree with every word of the author's preface, and especially commend their direction that "every lesson shall be carried on entirely in French." The lessons are both progressive and interesting, the subjects chosen being of intrinsic importance, so that the pupil learns something besides the language they are designed to teach.

"How Should I Pronounce?"<sup>26</sup> by Mr. W. H. Phyfe, is a treatise on English pronunciation by an American. His rules will, we doubt not, be very valuable in his own country; but it is impossible to accept any foreign standard for English pronunciation. As well might a Belgian or a Swiss set up a standard for correct French, as an American hope to teach Englishmen their native tongue.

We have received three of "The English Dialect Society's"<sup>27</sup> useful and interesting publications:—"A Word List, illustrating the Correspondence of Modern English with Anglo-French Vowel Sounds," by Mr. B. M. Skeat; "Upton-on-Severn Words and Phrases," by Mr. R. Lawson; and "A Glossary of Words used in the County of Chester," by Mr. R. Holland. We have found this last of especial interest, as the Cheshire dialect is unusually rich in archaic forms, both as regards words and idioms. The present number only reaches to F, so that more than half the alphabet remains to be explored.

<sup>21</sup> "Selections from Greek Authors for Translation at Sight." By John B. Kendrick, B.A. (Yale). Boston: Ginn, Heath & Co. 1885.

<sup>22</sup> "The Epistles of Horace." Edited by Augustus S. Wilkins, M.A. London: Macmillan & Co. 1885.

<sup>23</sup> "Latin Prose after the best Authors. Part I., Cæsarian Prose." By Francis P. Simpson, B.A., Balliol College, Oxford. London: Macmillan & Co. 1885.

<sup>24</sup> "Parallel-Homer oder Index aller homerischen Iterati, in lexikalescher Anordnung." By Carl Eduard Schmidt, Dr. Phil. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht's Verlag. 1885. London: Trübner & Co.

<sup>25</sup> "The Common Sense Method of Teaching French." By H. Pooley and K. Carnie. Swan Sonnenschein & Co., Paternoster Square, London. 1885.

<sup>26</sup> "How Should I Pronounce? or the Art of Correct Pronunciation." By Henry P. Phyfe. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1885.

<sup>27</sup> "English Dialect Society: A Word List." By B. M. Skeat. "Upton-on-Severn Words and Phrases." By R. Lawson, M.A. "A Glossary of Words used in the County of Chester." By Robert Holland, M.R.A.C. London: Trübner & Co. 1884.

We like the spirit in which Sir Philip Perring attempts to unravel the "Hard Knots"<sup>28</sup> in Shakespeare; it is thoroughly conservative, which is, in itself, no small recommendation; for anything like "radical reform" is out of place in dealing with the text of Shakespeare. Our knowledge is inadequate, and the importance of the subject makes conjectural solutions an impertinence. We do not, of course, pledge ourselves to all Sir Philip Perring's emendations of the text of "The Globe Shakespeare," but many of them commend themselves to us by their caution and by their reasonableness.

We have great pleasure in welcoming an elegant volume from Australia, entitled "Fernshawe."<sup>29</sup> It is a miscellany consisting of essays and poems by A. Patchett Martin, who was "bred and educated," he tells us, in Victoria. It is clearly and pleasantly written, and some of the sketches and criticisms of distinguished English men of letters are remarkably just and clear-sighted. There is a charming group of Australian ferns, drawn by a lady, and we are promised in the index a portrait of the author, which, however, does not appear. The marginal decorations are delicate and novel in design, though, perhaps, somewhat monotonous from too frequent repetition.

Mr. Sidney Whitman, in his "Fetish Worship in the Fine Arts,"<sup>30</sup> has succeeded in proving, to his own satisfaction, that our painters cannot paint, our actors act, nor our composers compose; but he has incidentally proved that he himself cannot write English. Nevertheless, though his *forme* is vicious, his *fond* (he is partial to French locutions) is not altogether false. Amidst a farrago of exaggerated and what he would call hysterical vituperation of our English ways of cultivating art and its interpreters, he does, no doubt, hit some very palpable blots. If his little book possessed more literary finish and sobriety of expression, it would be by no means unworthy of attention.

Mr. Parker's treatise on "The Nature of the Fine Arts,"<sup>31</sup> is both able and learned. It opens with an exhaustive review of the question: Which of the arts are properly termed "Fine Arts?" And an imposing array of conflicting authorities, ancient and modern, is adduced. We then reach the immediate subject of the book, which is, as we are told at the close of the introductory chapter, to examine the opinion now, as the author believes, universally held, "that if all academic authority could be swept away, some very perfect kind of painting might appear which the world has not yet seen." What follows may be said to be one long argument, or a succession of arguments, in which the author, with an unusual command of dialectic, pulverizes the modern theory of realism in art. His

<sup>28</sup> "Hard Knots in Shakespeare." By Sir Philip Perring, Bart. London: Longmans & Co. 1885.

<sup>29</sup> "Fernshawe: Sketches in Prose and Verse." By A. Patchett Martin. Griffith, Farran & Co. (successors to Newbery & Harris), West Corner of St. Paul's Churchyard, London.

<sup>30</sup> "Fetish Worship in the Fine Arts." By Sidney Whitman. London: Remington & Co., Henrietta Street, Covent Garden. 1885.

<sup>31</sup> "The Nature of the Fine Arts." By H. Parker, Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. London: Macmillan & Co. 1885.

arguments are applied to all the fine arts in turn; but though he, as it were, skirmishes against realism in music and in architecture, his main attack is directed against realism in painting, and, in a less degree, in sculpture. On all art questions, he sides with artists against art critics; he respects opinions which result from lifelong practice, but he is a determined adversary to the glib *littérateur*, whose best title to pose as art critic is that he "has never handled a brush." His own theories about the fine arts can be shortly given in his own words. At page 315 he says:—"All the four arts of the senses are thus based on a contradiction. Painting is the art of unsubstantial substance, statuary of inanimate animation or insentient feeling, architecture of inorganic organism, music of passionless passion, or unimpulsive impulse." That is to say, that in each the presentation must not be so real as to lead to illusion, or the pleasure which it is their purpose to cause is marred. The true end of the fine arts is not, we are told, to copy dull realities, but to give us glimpses of that golden age into which every one of us longs from time to time to escape. The passage is so eloquent that we cannot refrain from quoting it:—

Modern society is natural and yet unnatural, good and yet evil. Its customs, its passions, its opinions, and etiquette are inevitable, yet it is sweet to forget them. The poet and the artist lend their aid. They transport the reader or the auditor or spectator to an unknown realm where the realities of the second nature (that superinduced by long ages of civilization) do not trouble him, and the Beautiful, as it is called, is supreme. The Beautiful, in this wider sense, is only the name of a thousand feelings so vague that they cannot be defined, and so faint that one does not destroy another. These are called into existence by a magic wand which the poet and the artist hold, and the name of this wand is genius (p. 346).

"Landscape in Art,"<sup>32</sup> by Mr. Josiah Gilbert, is well written, and evinces a complete knowledge of its subject. Its contents will, no doubt, be highly interesting and important to those who live in and for art. To the general public it is somewhat heavy reading, not comparable in interest with Mr. Parker's treatise on "The Nature of the Fine Arts." It is part of the design of such a work to account for and explain the impressions we receive from the beauty or grandeur of natural objects. Thus Mr. Gilbert attributes our sense of the beauty of mountain forms to a consciousness of their fitness and purpose. The explanation is perhaps as good as any other. All attempts to explain the inexplicable are fruitless. A factory chimney is not a beautiful object, yet its fitness and purpose are obvious and undeniable. The numerous engravings from celebrated pictures are an attractive feature, and atone for some unavoidable dullness in the letter-press.

The latest addition to "The Parchment Library" is De Quincey's "Confessions of an English Opium-eater."<sup>33</sup> The editor, Mr. R.

<sup>32</sup> "Landscape in Art: before Claude and Salvator." By Josiah Gilbert. London: John Murray, Albemarle Street. 1885.

<sup>33</sup> "Confessions of an English Opium-eater, Thomas De Quincey, with Notes of De Quincey's Conversations." By Richard Wodehouse, and other Additions edited by Richard Garnett. Parchment Library. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1885.

Garnett, has, in our opinion, done his editorial work most judiciously. Sparing his readers the endless amplifications and redundancies of the edition of 1862, he has reprinted the original text of 1821; and the space thus saved is profitably employed, for, in addition to the *Confessions* themselves, we have a full account of the French version of them, undertaken and not unsuccessfully accomplished by Alfred de Musset at the early age of sixteen, together with a specimen from an entirely unauthorized episode introduced by him into De Quincey's work. Secondly, we have Wodehouse's "Notes of Conversations with De Quincey," which are interesting in many ways. Mr. Garnett's introduction contains much delicate and appreciative criticism. In fact, if his criticism has a fault, it is too appreciative, too eulogistic. We confess that, on re-perusal after an interval of many years, De Quincey is disappointing. He lacks, to our mind, three of the most essential attributes of a good writer—repose, simplicity, and directness. He is at his best in depicting the shadowy horrors of his opium dreams, but all his laboured intensity of expression fails to produce so impressive an image of deep suffering as is conveyed in one short phrase by Coleridge, who said of such dreams that they "sadden and stun the coming day"—words which none but a great poet could have found.

"Thoughts at Fourscore,"<sup>34</sup> by Thomas Cooper, hardly come within the pale of *belles lettres*; yet we know not where else they could more appropriately be placed. They contain something of everything; a good deal about politics and economics; still more about theology; and, last as well as least, the "Letters to Young Working Men" do treat, more or less, on English literature, and so enter the domain of *belles lettres*. Of these widely diverse topics, it is perhaps on economic questions that Mr. Cooper appears to most advantage. Here his close and prolonged acquaintance with working men—"workies," as he calls them—and his actual experience, as one of themselves, of their habits and thoughts, their needs and their aspirations, stand him in good stead. In despite of his strong democratic sentiments and opinions, he is somewhat *laudator temporis acti*, but that is to be expected in "thoughts at fourscore." *C'est de son age*. Still, on such subjects as strikes, free-trade *versus* protection, councils of arbitration, &c., he talks very good sense; it would be well if the "workies" had no worse advisers. The case is very different when he pits his self-taught and imperfect knowledge against the matchless science of Darwin, and attempts to show up "the fallacies of evolution." His objections are not worth discussion; their scope and value may be gauged by his disputing the fact of the periodical renewal of the constituent parts of our bodies, on the ground that, if it were true, we should never grow old! Of his sermons and polemical essays we shall say nothing; they belong to a class of literature which, we humbly confess, is beyond the range of our critical powers.

Sometime ago we noticed in THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW a novel called "Goddess Fortune," by Mr. T. Sinclair. We have now before

<sup>34</sup> "Thoughts at Fourscore, and Earlier: A Medley." By Thomas Cooper. Hodder & Stoughton, Paternoster Row. 1885.

us a little volume, by the same author, entitled "Quest."<sup>35</sup> We regret that we cannot speak of it one whit more favourably than we did of its predecessor. It is characterized by the same flimsy, incoherent fancies, hidden rather than expressed, in the same affected obscurity of language. Its true place would be in an *exposition des arts incohérents*.

Another specimen of *les arts incohérents* is "The North Wall,"<sup>36</sup> by John Davidson. An unsuccessful man of letters, apparently more than half mad, and entirely devoid of moral sense, conceives the idea, as things are going now, that "novel-writers will soon be in a majority, and novel-reading will become a lucrative employment"—a consummation most devoutly to be wished for, as it will seem to critics of *belles lettres*, novel-writing having become impossible, Mr. Lee (the unsuccessful author) sets to work to compose a novel in action, and commences with personating a rich man whom a street accident has placed at his discretion. A strong likeness between the two gives rise to the design, which leads to many bewildering *qui pro quos*, and much extravagantly comic business. The execution is fully as incoherent as the leading idea of the book; witness such sentences as the following:—"The rest was mere wild beating of the inane in the course of a straggling descent through vacuity."

"After London, or Wild England,"<sup>37</sup> is one of a class of books of which there have been many examples of late—books in which the author, not content with describing the present or reconstructing the past, strives by force of imagination to conjure up the remote future. That the future, whatever else it may be, will be utterly unlike any of our imaginings, is a reflection too obvious to be insisted on. Tales "of the future" can be but simple *jeux d'esprit*, or else mere vehicles for satire on the present. It is, apparently, to the former class that Mr. Jefferies's "Wild England" must be referred. He imagines England to have been abandoned by nearly the whole of its inhabitants; only a remnant, too poor or too helpless to get away, remaining. From these a new society slowly and gradually develops itself, without arts, inventions, commerce, or civilization of any kind. The very aspect of the land is metamorphosed. Not only has the forest recovered its ancient supremacy, obliterating towns, roads, farms, and even railway lines; but, by the silting up of the river mouths, the southern inland counties are turned into a huge lake, round which are clustered the principal new settlements. This lake may be said to be the main feature of the book. The most striking adventures narrated take place either on its surface or near its shores; and the author's best and most imaginative descriptions of scenery are connected with his favourite lake. The most thrilling and powerful passage in the whole work is when the hero of the tale sails, unknowingly, in his canoe, over the site of ancient London, and barely escapes

<sup>35</sup> "Quest." By Thomas Sinclair, M.A. Trübner & Co., Ludgate Hill. 1885.

<sup>36</sup> "The North Wall." By John Davidson. Glasgow: Wilson & McCormick, Saint Vincent Street. 1885.

<sup>37</sup> "After London; or, Wild England." By Richard Jefferies. In two parts. Part I. The Relapse into Barbarism. Part II. Wild England. London, Paris, New York, and Melbourne: Cassell & Co. 1885.

with life from the noxious and asphyxiating effluvia that continue to rise, as from a monstrous burial-ground, poisoning the water and the air. It is in placing clearly and picturesquely before us the physical scenery of his "Wild England" that Mr. Jefferies is most successful, and in this he shows considerable creative power. But his social pictures are far less powerful and real; they seem indeed to betray a certain poverty of invention. For his materials are taken wholesale and indiscriminatingly from the past. The whole state of things described is but a garbled reproduction of imperfectly developed feudalism—a recrudescence of mediævalism in an early stage, even to the knights in armour with lances in rest, war-horses, men-at-arms, *et tout le tremblement* (to use a vulgar but expressive French phrase). Now, all these things are not inventions, but traditions; they belong to a phase of human life long gone by, and which could hardly recur in precisely the same form as heretofore. The story, which serves as a thread to connect the pictures of scenery and manners, is not uninteresting, but unfortunately it breaks off abruptly. The book ends in the midst of the hero's adventures.

"Once for All"<sup>38</sup> is a simple and quite unsensational story of modern life and manners. The scene is laid entirely in Scotland, and the humours and peculiarities of Scotch servants and peasants are cleverly drawn. Children, too, are very naturally depicted. Indeed, the author, who is, we venture to surmise, an authoress, shows considerable power of character-painting, and a keen sense of the charms of natural scenery, in every phase, however subtle or fleeting.

"The Devil's Portrait,"<sup>39</sup> by Anton Giulio Barrilli, is an English translation of a modern Italian novel. It is the tragic and romantic story of Spinello Spinelli, a great Italian painter, who lived some five centuries ago. The whole tone and manner of treatment are very unlike those of an English novel, and this gives a certain charm of foreignness and freshness to the work. But the story itself has no need of such adventitious aid; its tenderness and deep passionate sadness must find an echo in every human heart. The translation, by Evelyn Wodehouse, seems to be very well done. At any rate, Miss Wodehouse has turned Italian into good English.

"Wilbourne Hall"<sup>40</sup> has but little resemblance to a modern novel. The first impression is that it must have been written half a century ago, and this impression does but deepen as the story proceeds. There is really nothing absolutely modern, from the first page to the last, but one casual mention of perambulators. This may be a triumph of art, for the action is apparently intended to date from the beginning of the century, but we fancy that its rococo air is due rather to a natural peculiarity in the author's style and mode of treatment, which differentiates her work from that of other contemporary novelists. For instance, there are no philosophical reflections, no discussions of contra-

<sup>38</sup> "Once for All: a Novel." By Max Hilliary. Three vols. Sampson Low & Co., Crown Buildings, Fleet Street. 1885.

<sup>39</sup> "The Devil's Portrait." By Anton Giulio Barrilli. Two vols. Remington & Co., Henrietta Street, Covent Garden. 1885.

<sup>40</sup> "Wilbourne Hall." By Mrs. Caumont. T. Fisher Unwin, Paternoster Square. 1885.



verted social or religious questions; in fact, none of the well-known features which one expects, and—unless the writer is really *hors ligne*—dreads, in a modern English novel. In “Wilbourne Hall” there is nothing but the story. It may not be told with any exceptional skill; the literary style might be better than it is; the characters might with advantage be more like ordinary mortals and less like personages out of old farces and melodramas. But the book, with all its faults, answers the purpose of its being—it both amuses and interests.

Of the tales contained in Mr. Walter Besant’s new volume,<sup>41</sup> most have appeared before, as contributions to periodical publications. None the less, under the title “Uncle Jack” (the name of the first story), they form a charming collection—such a volume as could be produced by no other pen than Mr. Besant’s.

We are glad to see that “The Laird’s Secret,”<sup>42</sup> which we favourably noticed last year in THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW, has reached a second edition. It now appears in one handsome volume, charmingly illustrated, and the story loses nothing by re-perusal.

“Some Stained Pages”<sup>43</sup> is not an attractive title, nor has it any perceptible fitness to the story so named. However, a good book with a bad title is better, and certainly rarer, than the converse, and “Some Stained Pages” is undoubtedly a good book unusually entertaining and interesting. The adventures of the youthful hero—a boy of eleven—as he painfully makes his way to London, are admirably told. Flying from a cruel task-master, he is thrown on the tender mercy of all sorts of rough people, and it is in the portrayal of varying shades of manners and speech among bargees, tramps, policemen, journeymen, printers, and such like, that the author’s ability is supremely manifested. We are often reminded of Dickens, but the author of “Stained Pages” is no servile imitator; his (or shall we say “her”) sketches have no tendency towards caricature. Closely interwoven with the dramatic history of the boy, there runs another story, sad from its very opening, and, as it seems to us, needlessly tragic in its *dénouement*.

“Zoroaster”<sup>44</sup> is a difficult book to judge. It produces two separate and discordant impressions. On the one hand, any one capable of gauging literary worth must feel that it is of finer texture than an ordinary novel—that the workmanship is more careful. Everything is considered—style, language, details of scenery, architecture, dress and manners. No pains nor thought nor research are spared to elaborate a realistic presentment of the time and country of Darius. It cannot be said either that the mounting, by its disproportionate rarity and *luxé*, effaces the piece which it was meant to heighten. There are, on the contrary, many finely conceived situations, and some

<sup>41</sup> “Uncle Jack,” &c. One vol. By Walter Besant. Chatto & Windus, Piccadilly. 1885.

<sup>42</sup> “The Laird’s Secret.” By Jane H. Jameison. One vol. Edinburgh: Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier. 1885.

<sup>43</sup> “Some Stained Pages: A Story of Life.” Three vols. London: Ward & Downey, York Street, Covent Garden. 1885.

<sup>44</sup> “Zoroaster.” By F. Marian Crawford. Three vols. London: Macmillan & Co. 1885.

scenes poignantly dramatic. The personages are in no sense lay figures, to be draped in shreds and *oripeaux* of antique erudition. They are quite real. But they are also quite modern. They speak, indeed, an archaic dialect bearing a strong resemblance to that used in Mr. A. Lang's translation of "The Iliad," but their thoughts, however clothed, belong exclusively to England—England in the latter half of the nineteenth century. And this, we believe, is the reason why, along with the impression of great care, and art of very high quality, there is an adverse and warring impression—namely, that the work does not interest in anything like proportion to its excellence. Many fictions, immeasurably inferior to "Zoroaster," possess far more power to stir, to fascinate, and to touch the hearts of their readers. The cause may, or may not, lie in the subtle anachronism to which we have traced it, but the effect seems to us to be indubitable.

We think we have just ground for disappointment in Mr. Black's new volume of "Miscellanies." There is a tale at the beginning called "The Wise Women of Inverness,"<sup>45</sup> a commonplace theme, but handled with the author's usual skill. Then there are some fugitive pieces of poetry, which we seem to have read before scattered over his novels; and "A Few Days more Driving," in which latter he has tried, and not wholly without success, to resuscitate the delightful sensations he gave us years ago in "The Strange Adventures of a Phaeton." But altogether the volume is made up of odds and ends which we are not content to accept instead of a new novel from the gifted author of "A Princess of Thule."

"Spanish Beauties"<sup>46</sup> is a tale of the Carlist war. The author, who assumes the *nom de plume* of "Penmacor" was apparently an English officer in the service of Isabel II. Many of the scenes and incidents out of which he has woven his romance came, as we learn from the preface, under his own observation, or were communicated to him by eye-witnesses. This gives an air of reality to the stirring and romantic events narrated. Even as it now stands, under all the disadvantages of amateur printing—for Penmacor has been his own compositor—"Spanish Beauties" is certainly an interesting story, and would, in our opinion, well repay the trouble and expense of good type and paper, together with a few touches from an experienced hand, to give it literary finish.

"A Modern Dædalus,"<sup>47</sup> by "Tom Greer," is one of the books which affect to narrate the events of an imaginary future as though they had really happened in the past. The introduction is dated 1887, and signed "John O'Halloran." The adventures which follow are related by him in the first person. He is the son of an Irish peasant, develops a turn for mathematics, and is educated at Trinity College, Dublin. The dream of his life is to invent some means of mechanical flight, and shortly after his return from the University to his father's farm, he succeeds in manufacturing wings, with which, after some shorter trial

<sup>45</sup> "The Wise Women of Inverness: a Tale, and other Miscellanies." By William Black. One vol. Macmillan & Co. 1885.

<sup>46</sup> "Spanish Beauties: Mena Aviler de Lara." By Penmacor. London.

<sup>47</sup> "A Modern Dædalus." By Tom Greer. London: Griffith, Farran & Co., West Corner St. Paul's Churchyard. 1885.

trips, he flies round the coast of Ireland in some six or seven hours. In his flight he sees an evicting agent murdered by a rifle-shot at 500 yards range, the murderer being his own brother. When his father and brothers discover the reality of his invention, they press him to put it at the disposal of the chiefs of a rebellion which is being concocted in Ireland. He refuses, and finally takes flight for England. Here the Government offer him a million for the exclusive use of his invention, and on his refusal, imprison him in the Clock Tower of St. Stephen's. He escapes with the help of one of his brothers, flies back to Ireland, now in full rebellion, and inaugurates what may literally be called "a flying column," which drops dynamite shells on the Castle at Dublin, more dynamite down the funnels of the ironclads in the Bay, destroys the English camp near Belfast, and the fleet riding in Belfast Lough, and, in short, "smashes up" the English and secures the "freedom and independence" of Ireland. The book is smartly written and displays no small share of that circumstantial imagination of which Gulliver's Travels is the most signal example. "Tom Greer" (we know not whether it is the author's real name or a *nom de plume*) evidently revels in fictive descriptions of English discomfiture by Irish prowess, but the moral of his book really is—quite contrary to his intention, we suspect—that an Irish rebellion has no chance of success until by some miracle the Irish should become possessed of the power of flight—of flight, too, of a kind with which no former rebellion has familiarized them.

The authoress of "So Runs my Dream"<sup>48</sup> apologizes, in a short preface, for her "dream story," and expresses a hope that she has effectually screened herself from "the blunt arrows of matter-of-fact criticism." Nevertheless she "dreams" in a style so stilted, interspersed with such palpable lapses both in grammar and orthography, that we fear her hope will hardly be realized. Such mal-apropos as the "stentorian breathing" of a man in a fit are not likely to pass unnoticed. But her story has really nothing in common with dreams. It is a dismal story turning upon hereditary madness, or rather the hereditary character of insanity. A girl is brought up in a sort of mystic renunciation of personal happiness. Love and marriage have no place in her scheme of life; she is taught to find the sole outlet for her affections in ministering to others. As might have been foreseen, she falls in love, and then too late she learns the bitter truth, foolishly concealed from her till then, that she comes of a race who have one and all been hopelessly mad. At the risk of being classed as "matter-of-fact critics," we venture to protest against the increasing tendency of novelists to lend to their stories a factitious interest by making capital out of diseased conditions which are more appropriately treated by medical specialists than by romance writers.

The "Queen of Sheba"<sup>49</sup> is charmingly written, but the beauty and attractiveness of the tale are marred by a mad heroine. The horror

<sup>48</sup> "So Runs my Dream." By Nellie Fortescue-Harrison. Two vols. Remington & Co., Henrietta Street, Covent Garden. 1885.

<sup>49</sup> "The Queen of Sheba." By Thomas Bailey Aldrich. Edinburgh: David Douglas. 1885.

and ghastliness of the situation are attenuated and toned down by every artifice which the great skill of Mr. Aldrich can put into play, but the fact remains that when the hero and heroine first meet, she has temporarily escaped from a madhouse, and informs her future lover that she is "the Queen of Sheba!" Such an incident is, no doubt, sufficiently "sensational," but the sensations it awakes in us are of a somewhat shuddery kind. Still the style is so pleasant, the descriptions of scenery so exact and yet so poetic, that we are glad not only that Mr. David Douglas has added "The Queen of Sheba" to his collection of American authors, but that the remainder of Mr. Aldrich's works are to follow in due course.

Between Midnight and Dawn,<sup>50</sup> by Ina L. Cassilis, is one of those novels with a supernaturally beautiful and impossibly perfect heroine, with "golden hair," slender, fragile form, and, to crown all, gifted with second sight. She hears "the Banshee" in an English country-house, witnesses her husband's murder in a mesmeric trance, ensnares and hunts down his murderer, and finally marries the gifted barrister under whose directions she acted. Some readers may admire it. To us, though it barely fills one volume, it seems long. The remaining pages are made out with a little story, which, though obviously impossible, is more amusing than its predecessor.

It has rarely been our lot to meet with a more coarsely painted picture of Irish life and manners than Mrs. Hannah Lynch has given us in "Through Troubled Waters."<sup>51</sup> The story opens with an unnatural mother poisoning three daughters consecutively, to make way for her bastard son, who is the hero of the book. French authors are fond of illegitimate heroes, but they do not go down so well in English works of fiction. Nor do blasphemous oaths look well in the writing of a feminine author. The Connaught family who are the prominent figures in the story are, beyond all belief, coarse and vulgar. Minute details of gross immorality and copious specimens of foul language, alternate with tedious rhapsodies about the wide grey eyes of the heroine, and the white hands of her lover. We cannot find anything to commend to our readers in "Through Troubled Waters."

"This Year, Next Year, Some Time, Never,"<sup>52</sup> is a poor frittering title, but good enough for the story which it is intended to shadow forth. The work abounds in faults both of structure and of execution. It is too minute an analysis of the daily lives of the personages represented. "Specimen days" are all very well, but we do not want an exact log of all their sayings and doings set down without choice or discrimination. As for the execution, the writing is extremely faulty. Strings of words are connected by hyphens till one might think that English was an agglutinative rather than an inflectional language. The French introduced is lamentable—*e.g.*, "*bête noir*," "*l'eau chaul*," and so on.

<sup>50</sup> "Between Midnight and Dawn." By Ina L. Cassilis. One vol. Vizetelly & Co., Catherine Street, Strand. 1885.

<sup>51</sup> "Through Troubled Waters: a Novel." By Hannah Lynch. London: Ward, Lock & Co., Warwick House, Salisbury Square, E.C. 1885.

<sup>52</sup> "This Year, Next Year, Some Time, Never." By Puck. Two vols. London: Field & Tuer.

"A Wayside Violet"<sup>53</sup> is absolutely unreadable; neither idealistic nor realistic, but simply tiresome. The jargon which a German governess is made to talk is like nothing but Mrs. Plornish's Italian—"me 'ope you leg well soon," "peak-a-padrona," &c. The story ends well, and is contained in one volume—two mitigating circumstances.

"Leicester"<sup>54</sup> is a strange, mad book; copious, even diffuse, yet so vague that it tells nothing. The hero indulges in bursts of tears, whose cause is for the most part a secret to which the reader is not admitted; at other times he is convulsed by equally inexplicable laughter. He is constantly talking about his "soul;" and addresses irreverent, and even discourteous, interpellations to some deity, of whose existence, however, he seems to be anything but assured. "Leicester" is, perhaps, a shade less tedious than "A Wayside Violet," but that is the highest praise we can give it, for it is utterly and wilfully irrational.

The latest issue of the Educational Classics of Messrs. Ginn, Heath & Co. is the story of "Leonard and Gertrude,"<sup>55</sup> translated and abridged by Eva Channing from the voluminous work written by Pestalozzi towards the end of the last century. We are told that the original is in six volumes, and that the style is more prolix and tedious than can be imagined. All the more praise is due; then, to the translator, who must have had a wearisome and difficult task to produce anything readable out of such materials. Naturally the purpose of the book is purely didactic; Pestalozzi's aim is to show that enlightened and good women are the born teachers of mankind, and that their benign influence must flow from the home circle into the community. Thus the story is a sort of allegory. Bonnal, a remote Swiss village, is meant for the world. The wicked bailiff is Intemperance, and every other vice; while Gertrude is the "good teacher" who is to regenerate the world, and whose "key-words" resemble the pearls and diamonds which fell from the mouth of the good princess in the fairy tale.

We have received "The Gordon Birthday Book,"<sup>56</sup> edited by Mary Frances Billington. The interest in these collections of extracts, felt no doubt by many, must necessarily be accentuated in this one, which contains the words of the dead hero, who was as remarkable for his simple piety and great humility as he was for his bravery and endurance. The little book is nicely printed and conveniently arranged as a diary, with an index for names at the end.

"To see ourselves as others see us," is no doubt wholesome, and agreeable too, when we are viewed in so favourable a light as by M. Gabriel Sarrazin in his "Poètes Modernes de l'Angleterre."<sup>57</sup> He

<sup>53</sup> "A Wayside Violet." One vol. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co., Paternoster Square 1885.

<sup>54</sup> "Leicester: an Autobiography." By Francis W. L. Adams. Two vols. George Redway, York Street, Covent Garden. 1885.

<sup>55</sup> "Pestalozzi's Leonard and Gertrude." Translated and abridged by Eva Channing. Educational Classics. Boston: published by Ginn, Heath & Co. London: Trübner. 1885.

<sup>56</sup> "The Gordon Birthday Book." Edited by Mary Frances Billington. Remington & Co., Henrietta Street, Covent Garden. 1885.

<sup>57</sup> "Poètes Modernes de l'Angleterre." By Gabriel Sarrazin. Paris: Paul Ollendorff, Rue de Richelieu. 1885. London: Trübner & Co.

has chosen as the motto of his book a highly eulogistic passage from M. Taine's "Notes sur l'Angleterre," extolling English poetry beyond all other, and his own criticisms are, on the whole, abundantly appreciative. The poets selected as representative of the modern school of poetry in England are Landor, Shelley, Keats, Elizabeth Barrett Browning, Rossetti, and Swinburne. Against the choice of the first three names there is nothing to be said, but the claims of the second triad are more questionable. No selection of English modern poets can be held to be complete, much less to be representative, from which the names of Tennyson and Browning are absent. If the suffrages of competent critics are divided in awarding to one or the other of these great names the first place among English poets, few will dispute the claim of both to be regarded as above all rivalry with the rest of their contemporaries. Why then has M. Sarrazin passed them over in favour of Mrs. Barrett Browning and Mr. Rossetti? Both undoubtedly must be classed as minor poets, and Rossetti, besides being the exponent of a by no means universally popular school, was English only by the accident of birth and language. It would not answer any good purpose to enter into a detailed analysis of M. Sarrazin's critical studies; they are conscientiously painstaking, thoughtful, and intelligent. His French versions are especially admirable; but, nevertheless, he has not completely grasped his subject. He does not elucidate any of the authors of whom he treats, as, for instance, M. Taine elucidated Mill and Carlyle. His analysis of the poetry, as poetry, is for the most part unimpeachable. With the technique of the versification he is, as might be expected, more at home than with the sentiments, aspirations, and tendencies embodied in it; but it is when he attempts to explain the poet's utterances by considerations of race and inheritance that M. Sarrazin loses himself. Nowhere is his imperfect grasp of his subject more amusingly betrayed than where he ascribes Mr. Swinburne's hysterical violence of expression to Atavism and the resurgence of *le vieux sang Anglo-Saxon*. The phenomena of Atavism are not so simple as M. Sarrazin may perhaps imagine, nor are the English of to-day so uniformly of Saxon blood as he seems to take for granted they are. Besides, neither to the Anglo-Saxon race, nor to the highly composite race which has succeeded them, can fairly be imputed any pre-eminence in ferocity over other European races. It was not to us nor to our ancestors that Voltaire applied the epithet of *Tigres Singes*. The legends of the Lollard's Tower, which have so deeply impressed M. Sarrazin, pale before the massacre of St. Bartholomew, or the horrors of the Spanish Inquisition, and what are the "*répressions de l'Irlande par Elizabeth et Cromwell*," compared with the wholesale butchery of the reign of terror?

"*La Morale dans le Drame, l'épopée et le Roman*,"<sup>58</sup> is the title which taken in conjunction with the tongue in which it is formulated, is bewildering to an Englishman, and seems somehow a contradiction in

<sup>58</sup> "*La Morale dans le Drame l'épopée et le Roman*." Par Lucien Arréat. Félix Alcan, éditeur, 108, Boulevard le Germain. 1884.

terms. We thought it was the traditional Englishman "*raide et gourmé*," with his "*longues dents*," and his still longer *favoris*, *couleur filassé*," who was "*toujours à cheval sur la morale*," while the *vieil esprit Gaulois* soared high above such "*mesquineries bourgeoises*." However, M. Lucien Arréat evidently takes the subject *au sérieux*, and even "outherods Herod" in earnestness. He has written a very good book, full of the modern evolutionary spirit, with a careful and laborious erudition worthy of all praise, he collects from ancient authors such evidence as they afford of each successive step in the evolution of the moral sentiments. His examples are mainly drawn from the Greek dramatists, with occasional references to the *Chanson de Roland*, and thence, by an association of ideas inevitable in a Frenchman, to Corneille and Racine. He frequently cites the Vedas, and such of the Icelandic sages as have been done into French: but of the Bible he makes but little mention, though, rightly read, it surely contains more "human nature" than a wilderness of Greek tragedies, while to the microcosm of the world created by Shakespeare he refers briefly and disparagingly as "*les drames barbares de Shakspeare*." It is true, that towards the close of the volume he follows step by step the psychological process by which the noble nature of Othello becomes warped and distorted by jealousy; but the method of the great master is evidently trivial and uncouth in the eyes of M. Arréat. Shakespeare is indeed the very opposite of Corneille; he, beyond all other writers, abstains from pointing a moral. Now Corneille, and in somewhat less degree Racine, are eternally occupied with accentuating in declamatory speeches the moral quality of which each of their personages is, before all else, the representative. And this, we take it, is the reason why Shakespeare delights and edifies all ages and every race of men, while Corneille is hardly opened, outside of France, by any but professed students of literature.

From the "Clarendon Press Series" we have received "Edgar Quinet: *Lettres à sa Mère*,"<sup>59</sup> selected and edited by Mr. G. Saintsbury, who has done his work thoroughly well. The letters are happily chosen, and the explanatory notes satisfactory.

Voltaire's "*Mérope*"<sup>60</sup> is another addition to the "Clarendon Press Series," the prolegomena, notes, introduction, &c., being supplied by the same skilful hand.

We have much pleasure in announcing the publication of an English translation of Monsieur Lussy's original and masterly work on "*Musical Expression*."<sup>61</sup> We signified our appreciation and admiration of it when it first appeared in French; and we strongly recommend all students of music, who have not yet seen the book, to make themselves acquainted with it. Messrs. Novello, Ewer & Co. are to be congratulated on having rendered it accessible to English readers.

<sup>59</sup> "Edgar Quinet: *Lettres à sa Mère*." Selected and edited by George Saintsbury. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1885.

<sup>60</sup> "Voltaire's *Mérope*." Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by G. Saintsbury. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1885.

<sup>61</sup> "Musical Expression, Accents, Nuances, and Tempo, in Vocal and Instrumental Music." By M. Mathis Lussy. Translated from the Fourth Edition by Miss M. E. von Glehn. London & New York: Novello, Ewer & Co.

THE  
WESTMINSTER  
AND  
FOREIGN QUARTERLY  
REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1885.

ART. I.—INDUSTRIAL CO-OPERATION.

1. *The History of Co-operation in England, its Literature and its Advocates.* By G. JACOB HOLYOAKE. Two vols. London: Trübner & Co. 1875–1879.
2. *A Manual for Co-operators.* Edited by THOMAS HUGHES, Q.C., and E. V. NEALE, published for the CENTRAL CO-OPERATIVE BOARD. Manchester. 1881.
3. UGO RABBENO, *La Co-operazione in Inghilterra.* Saggio di Sociologia Economica. Milano: Fratelli Dumolard. 1885.
4. *Report of the Seventeenth Annual Co-operative Congress,* 1885. Edited by E. V. NEALE, General Secretary.
5. GODIN, *Mutualité Sociale et Association du Capital et Travail*, ou Extinction du Paupérisme par la consécration du droit naturel des faibles au nécessaire, et du droit des Travailleurs à participer aux bénéfices de la Production.
6. *Bulletin de la Participation aux bénéfices.* Publié par la Société formée pour faciliter l'étude pratique des diverses méthodes de participation du personnel dans les bénéfices de l'entreprise. 7me Année. Part 1re. Paris: Imprimerie Chaix. 1885.
7. *Jahresbericht für 1883, über die auf Selbsthülfe gegründeten Deutschen Erwerbs- und Wirthschafts-Genossenschaften.* Von F. SCHENCK. Anwalt des allgemeinen Deutschen Genossenschafts-Verbandes. Leipzig: Julius Klinkhardt. 1884.

[Vol. CXXIV. No. CCXLVIII.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LXVIII. No. II. X



8. *Bericht über die Erwerbs-und-Wirthschafts Genossenschaften in Oesterreich und Ungarn für das Jahr 1881.* Von H. ZILLER. Wien. 1883.
9. *La Fraternité Humaine.* Par FRANCESCO VIGANO. Traduction de M<sup>me</sup>. JULES FAVRE, née VELTEN. Paris : Libraire Guillaumin et Cie. 1880.
10. *Statistica delle Banche Popolari.* Alla Fine del 1883, Ministero di Agricoltura, Industria e Commercio. Roma. 1885.

THE works forming the title of this article may serve to direct the attention of our readers to a deep current of thought and action upon which the vessel of human society appears to be now decidedly entering ; no doubt with the risks always attending the approach to land, but, if we are not much mistaken, with the fair prospect of being borne on by it to the haven towards which, for long ages, its course has been directed by the power that "shapes our ends, rough hew them how we will." All of them relate to the practice of association, which has been applied of late years in a manner so novel that it may justly claim to have the character of a new principle. In itself, association is of very ancient parentage upon the earth. Foreshadowings of it meet us in many shapes, in different races of living beings, belonging to various orders of life, among whom it does not rise to more than that somewhat mysterious result of tendencies accumulated by hereditary transmission in successive generations, which we call Instinct. And among mankind there has shown itself a similar disposition, modified by the faculty of definite choice, in the determination of the ends to be pursued and the means to be selected for attaining them, belonging to man from his greater intelligence. Men have formed associations for an endless variety of purposes, but hitherto always with the object or expectation, avowed or implied, of attaining some special advantage for the associates at the cost, or to the exclusion, of the non-associated. Even the widest associations, the churches of Buddhists, of Christians, and of Mahometans—we name them in the order of their dates—are not free from this charge. No doubt they have been ready to admit all mankind to their respective folds, but on the condition that they come in as true sheep, by the door of beliefs, to be accepted with unquestioning submission. The untold blessings that they have professed to secure in a future life for those who accept their teaching have been limited to these orthodox believers. Still more clearly does this exclusive character belong to all those infinitely varied forms of association for protection, production, or exchange, which have given birth to the states

guilds, confraternities, or companies of ancient or modern times. Without any, or at least with quite insignificant exceptions, they have been unions of a more or less large number of persons, who by that union hoped to attain some special benefit for themselves without regard for, or at the cost of, those who did not form part of the union. It is the essential difference and characteristic principle of the unions distinguished at the present time as co-operative, to place, as the basis of union, the promotion of the general advantage—the advantage, that is to say, of all who are willing to form part of the union—to be obtained, not at the cost of other men, but by means of the greater facilities afforded to each member individually, through the action of the collective body, for doing what he desires to effect individually. Hence arises the great importance that the advocates of Co-operative Association assign to it. Assuming, as they do assume, that the evils under which modern society groans are the natural result of the principle of struggle by which our social institutions are generally pervaded, they believe in no effectual remedy for these evils but the general prevalence of institutions embodying the opposite principle—of concert. And they feel warranted in the belief that the general prevalence of such institutions would supply an effectual remedy, not a mere palliative, of these evils, because this principle of concert—of means appropriately chosen, co-ordinated for ends deliberately adopted, without any avoidable waste—is the characteristic of reasonable action, and must therefore be reasonably expected to conduce to the permanent welfare of a being who claims, and glories in the claim, to be a reasonable creature—that is to say, a creature, the essential character of whose action is to complement the action of natural force by integrating what Nature differentiates, proceeding from division to unity, where Nature, so far as we are able to trace her action, has proceeded from unity to division; separating in order to unite, while Nature unites in order to separate.

It would carry us too far from our present subject to enter upon a detailed discussion of these characters, but the conception is so important in its bearing upon our subsequent argument, that we ask for a few minutes' consideration of the following propositions relating to it. From the earliest dawn of intelligent action up to its loftiest achievements the process of our minds appears to us to be always the same—namely (1) a constructive action of what we call the imagination, by which we present to our consciousness mental objects; and (2) based upon this constructive action, a process of analysis, carried on in order that, by dissecting these mental objects into their parts, we may be able to trace out the relations between them, and thus make

clearly intelligible to ourselves and explainable to others the bond or principle of union by which they are held together. To this process our physical constitution lends itself in the original act of perceiving natural objects. Our eyes cannot see clearly more than a very small portion of any considerable object at the same time, so that in looking at such objects carefully we must move our eyes successively over them, and thus by the act of vision construct them in imagination. Now, no doubt, in the mental construction by which we thus apprehend natural objects, we endeavour to follow the lead of Nature, to bring together phenomena which are naturally connected, and arrange them in the order of space and time which naturally belongs to them. Still, careful observation shows, as Bishop Berkeley pointed out, that, in thus following the lead of Nature, we are not passive recipients of her action, but by our own mental activity put together the impressions she makes upon us. Yet more clearly is this constructive action of our minds apparent when we pass from the simple perception, which we share with animals, to that distinctively human operation—language. It is impossible to think distinctly without embodying our thoughts in some symbolic representation, expressed or conceived; in other words, without bringing together in our minds that of which we think and its symbol, and constructing a unity out of them. Our conceptions are equations, of which the mental act forms one side and the sensible act the other. Until we bring the two sides together conception remains in the germ—a mere capacity of thinking without any complete thought. Now, to form these symbols, Nature has provided us with an admirable machinery in the organs of speech, that marked character of men as Homer saw of old,\* which provides us with an endless variety of indefinitely elastic physical strings, admirably fitted to tie together the matters that we desire to constitute into mental objects under the two great classes of activities or passivities—verbs and substantives—which form the staple of our discourse, and thus to facilitate that bundle-forming faculty, recognized as characteristic of our mental operations by Locke, though without seeing clearly what it involved.

This constructive operation takes a more recondite form when the words used bring before us, not an individual thing, but a “thing after its kind.” It has indeed been maintained by very clear-headed thinkers, that in this operation we exercise a mental process the reverse of construction. We “abstract,” it has been urged, from the object certain characteristics, and apply them as signs by which to recognize other things possessing similar characteristics. Listen to Archbishop Whately for instance:—“If I omit the mention and

Meropos, “distinctly speaking,” is his favourite epithet for mankind.

the consideration of every circumstance which distinguishes Etna from any other mountain, I then form a notion expressed by the common term 'mountain,' which inadequately designates Etna—that is, which does not apply to any one of its peculiarities, and is equally applicable to any one of several other individuals." \* Now, even if we allow the Archbishop's account of the formation of these common words to be a correct description of the process, it would not dispense with the constructive action of our mind in its use; for to ascertain that any other observed object does possess similar characteristics with the one from which the common sign is supposed to be abstracted, we must in imagination bring this object and the sign together. But, *pace tanti viri*, we must ask of which peculiarity of Etna could we omit all consideration in forming a common notion of a mountain from it? Not its height, for all mountains are high; nor its rugged sides, for all mountains have their valleys and their buttresses; nor its woody base, nor yet its snowy summits, nor its volcanic flames, for many other mountains possess similar peculiarities, and the fact that Etna possesses them proves them to be mountain possibilities. Even its geographical position cannot be omitted, for how are we to get our conception of chains of mountains if in the notion of a mountain its geographical position is not included? That the notion would become "inadequate" in proportion to the peculiarities omitted we allow. If all were left out, the "common term mountain abstracted from Etna," would have no meaning at all; but we presume the Archbishop would not have been more satisfied with his theory on that account. The truth is that the theory is a blunder. It confuses the string which ties the bundle up, with the contents of the bundle. No doubt the strings used to fasten together our mental bundles do ordinarily convey vague and imperfect notions about the objects thus united. Much is included by them which they do not indicate; but it is not the office of common or general words to produce this vagueness. Scientific thinkers are perpetually toiling to attain more comprehensive common terms. Will it, therefore, be contended that their aim is to produce conceptions of individuals perpetually growing vaguer and less perfect? The case is quite the reverse.

Listen to the account given by M. Flourens, the late eminent Secretary of the French Institute, of the preparation required for the proper description of a species:—"Il faut l'observer pendant longtemps. Il faut le voir se développer, et se reproduire. Il faut en étudier naturel, les instincts, l'intelligence, chacun de

---

\* "Logic," ch. iv. § 6. So Dean Mansel defines general terms as "the inadequate representation of individuals." "Metaphysics," p. 38.

ces choses a dans chaque animal un caractère propre, et c'est par l'ensemble de ces caractères que se définit l'espèce."\* Th is a very different conception from the inadequate representations of Archbishop Whately or Dean Mansel. Yet the result of all the labours described by M. Flourens might be the discovery of one or two characters peculiar to the animal under examination, and to a number more or less considerable of other animals, which might thus be constituted into a group that the naturalist would properly define by these characters only, because they would form the most appropriate string for binding this group of animals into a mental bundle. But the object presented to the mind of the naturalist would be the whole group of animals thus formed, under all the many varieties by which the different animals referred to it were distinguished. To a person unacquainted with these varieties, the definition would, no doubt, remain "vague and imperfect"; he would perceive only the string, but not what it tied together. But we must not adduce the vagueness of ignorance to explain the process by which we acquire knowledge.†

Now, if the action of our reason is thus essentially constructive, even in those spheres of action where its action appears to be least free, where it is most closely tied to the phenomena presented to it, no one, surely, will be disposed to question that it preserves this character in the operations of pure science, to which we give the name of mathematics; in the spheres of poetry, where the name of *poietes*, the maker, testifies to the appreciation of this constructive character by the Greeks; in music; in the arts of painting, and sculpture, and in architectural or industrial inventions. We pass, then, to the conclusion, for the sake of which we have entered upon this digression, that what is true of reasonable action in every other sphere must be true of it in the sphere of practical life. Surely if constructive action is the general character of our intelligence, those cannot be in error who urge that, in the conduct of their lives, men can never attain the true end (*telos*) of their own being; can never enter upon a state with which their reason can be satisfied in its reflective judgments so long as the condition of these lives are not determined by the constructive action of the reason in the combination of appropriate means for the realization of such ends as it deliberately approves, but are left to be decided by the

\* Flourens, "De l'instinct des Animaux," p. 202, fourth edition.

† To express the suggestive character of general terms, modern writers on logic have invented the phrase of "connotation," which states the fact that words constantly include a great deal more than they express, but without accounting for it.

mere *natural* results of a trial of strength in the "struggle for existence"—that is to say, by the form of action proper to beings who do not possess a reasonable will, and yet are capable of acting upon each other.

In fact, the proposition is no new one, though the tendencies that have become prevalent in European society during the last three or four hundred years give it somewhat of the stamp of novelty. The instincts of mankind long since leapt to the conclusion that, for the general well-being, the common life of men must not be left to be guided by unregulated desires, but required to be co-ordinated under a reasonable rule. The legislators of whom ancient history has so much to tell us, especially among the nations who manifested the highest mental faculties, and claimed to be peculiarly the representatives of free thought and free action, are so many witnesses to this wide-spread conception. That they failed in their attempts to establish such a rule was due, we conceive, to a cause which they were not in a position to appreciate duly, but on which those who in the present age seem disposed to repeat the same experience would do well to meditate earnestly.

In Goethe's correspondence with Zeller there is an account of the desire of Zeller to compose an oratorio, which should contrast the Old Testament with the New. Zeller never accomplished his project; but there remains the record of Goethe's suggestion to his musical friend, that the oratorio should embody as its theme the opposition of "thou shalt" to "thou wilt." With the exception of Plato, whose Republic rests upon the conception of an education whereby the governing body should be so trained that they would "will" only what promoted the general welfare, the legislators of antiquity seem to have approached the problem of social construction from the outside. It was with them always a question of "thou shalt." The conception of "thou wilt," did not become prominent in our Western world till the rise of the Christian Church; which offered the spectacle of large bodies of men, who, not only without any external constraint, but in opposition to the determined efforts of the governing power to disperse them, were held together by a voluntary union open to all, and founded on the faith that, through its means, all its members might attain benefits, compared with which every other consideration sank into insignificance, by following a rule of life, sanctioned by the hope of attaining or the fear of losing this great reward. On the assumed certainty of this loss or gain, which lies wholly beyond the sphere of present experience, subsequent events and researches have cast great and increasing doubt; materially weakening and threatening ultimately to

undermine that firm trust in an endless, future, individual existence, whence the teachings of the Church have drawn their sanction. The doubts belong to that reflective action of the reason, which, by continually analyzing its imaginative constructions, prepares the way for more perfect conceptions. To repress them would, as Dr. Johnson might have said, be neither desirable if it were possible, nor possible if it were desirable. But these obstinate questionings leave untouched the power of the reason, in the exercise of its constructive action, to reconstitute in a less questionable form the conceptions criticized. They in no way impair that great lesson, taught by the history of Christianity, that the highest expression of the faculty of reason is found in "thou wilt." It is a case of *reculer pour mieux sauter*. The critical analysis of the conceptions on which ancient faith embodied its hopes may, and we believe will, bring back, under a form adapted to our present knowledge, the acceptance of that faith, whose growth we may trace in the Old Testament, and see in the New Testament manifested as a hope to be immediately fulfilled, of a Kingdom of God, a reign of righteousness and justice, and universal well-being, to be realized *on earth*. Only this modern faith will look for the realization of its hopes, not to a *coup de théâtre*, such as the imagination of the first Christian century anticipated, in dreams, whose accomplishment generation after generation of believers have looked for during eighteen centuries in vain; but to the earnest application of human energy to become true "co-workers with God," by converting the "not me" of sense into the instrument of its own aspirations; and subordinating the differentiating action, which has wrought out the richness of Nature through "the struggle for existence," to that integrating action, which out of this rich variety may educe the harmonious concert of a reasonable life.

Of this integrating action we claim for the principle of association, under the true Catholic flag of voluntary union, called Co-operation, to be the legitimate, and, we trust, the *very* enduring and beneficent offspring realizing within the wide domain of industry, that general well-being the indispensable condition of general morality, for which the way has been prepared, by the triumphs of scientific research, by the marvels of inventive genius, by the facilities of intercommunication with its corresponding diminution of national rivalry, and by the growth of those vast orderly communities which afford to peaceful union the protection of law.

It may perhaps be objected that, if Co-operation had really so important a part to play in the future of human history as the claim thus made on its behalf implies, it would have made itself

felt as an efficient element in social life long since. We reply that we must not measure by the impatience, natural to our short-lived individualities, the long course of the evolution of humanity. Human existence cannot be confined to the period of which we possess recorded notice. According to the conclusions of geological research, that period bears to the unrecorded period a proportion much less considerable than the luminous part of the solar spectrum bears to the non-luminous. Before the human will could be brought to "choose the good and eschew the evil" of natural existence, evil, not in itself, but for the life of reason, so much preparation was needed, that we cannot justly wonder at the time required to make it. The development of our moral, no less than that of our intellectual faculties, has been partial; manifested in some races of men much more decidedly than in others; and manifesting itself, even where it has been developed most fully, first in a few great men, who have been luminous points whence the light has gradually spread through the surrounding mass. For the growth of that practical reason which Kant showed us to be the highest form of this great power, there has been required the combined action of various races of men, of whom each has contributed its share to the general effect. The Greek, the Jew, the Roman, the Teuton, and the Celt and the Norman, were needed to conspire in forming the mental constitution fitted to grapple with the problem, so simple apparently and yet so hard to solve, of substituting, as the governing element in the conduct of ordinary life, in the process of feeding, clothing, housing and educating mankind, the law of integration; the supernatural,\* reasonable principle of concert in place of the law of differentiation, the natural pre-reasonable principle of struggle; from which we can no more escape than we can escape from the so-called law of gravitation, but to which we cannot entrust the constitution of a reasonable human order, any more than we could entrust to gravitation the construction of a bridge. The abolition of slavery, the elevation of woman from the plaything or the tyrant of man into his companion and coadjutrix; the extinction of international wars, by the general introduction of federative Union, the possibility of creating universal abundance, by the use of labour-saving machines—all this needed to become fact, either realized, or looming upon the horizon and ready to rise above it, before the great step, which shall turn into a reality the angelic salutation of "peace on earth and goodwill to mankind," by ending the intestine warfare of the "haves" and the "haves not," could be taken with any prospect.

\* Not to be confused with anti-national, or miraculous, as is often the case.



of permanent success. Has the time arrived when there is a well-grounded prospect that this step may "at last" be taken?

The rapid growth of the forms of association indicated by the publications whose titles are placed at the head of this article; the hold that this principle has obtained over great masses of the population in the most important European centres of industry, including large employers of labour as well as numerous bodies of the employed; the tone of moral earnestness and the wide outlook to future results, combined with the distinctive recognition of the voluntary character indispensable to the success of these constructive operations, apparent in the ideas of the intellectual leaders of this gospel of industry—all this leads us to regard the present movement, not as a passing wave, but as the growing light of that brighter day, that "good time coming," to which mankind has so long looked forwards with unquenchable hope. Let us shortly follow the story of this growth.

As in previous great spiritual movements, so in this the ideal has preceded the real. First came the prophets of social reform to be worked out by associated effort. Robert Owen in the British Isles, St. Simon and C. Fourier in France, Schulze-Delitzsch in Germany, followed, at least in France and Germany, by disciples, critics, or rivals with conflicting and confusing theories; and then have come the efforts of those whom the new faith has inspired to realize a life conformable to its teachings. And, as in earlier days, so in this case, the peaceful action on which the possibility of a permanent advance depends, has been intermixed with, and more or less thwarted by, attempts to gain by the short steep cut of "thou shalt," what can be won only by the winding path of "thou wilt," and stimulate into a forced existence that social vegetation which can live only where it is a spontaneous growth.

There is some encouragement, however, even about these contending influences. The circumstances of the present age, the greatly increased power of government to repress the outbreaks of direct violence on the one hand, and on the other the development of popular power by the ballot box, and the small amount of property qualification required in a voter amounting in some cases to the absence of any qualification at all, has given to this militant socialism a milder form than was assumed in former days, by the struggles of those who appealed to the martial sword to decide questions which can be decided only by the sword of the spirit. It has become in France, in Germany, and to some extent also in the United States of North America, an idea of State Socialism, which is to re-constitute the whole fabric of society by first obtaining the control of the government

through the votes of the body of the people, and then, by legislative enactments, regulating the machinery of production and distribution, with the concurrence of the present owners of capital, if they will fall into the arrangements adopted by the mass of the population, in the view of the general welfare, and if they will not thus concur, then by appropriating their property—without their concurrence and without compensation, by legal robbery. But, after all, these schemes of war are to be a war not of “bayonets but of ballots.” That they should find many supporters is not surprising, when we consider how certain they are to be acceptable, both to all who would rise to power on the shoulders of the masses in whose interest they profess to act, and to all who desire to be lifted into comfort without trouble by ordering wealth to flow into the channels which shall conduct it to their own doors. It is the more reassuring for those who look forward to the application of the principle of association as the true *sesame*, opening the way to a brighter condition of humanity, to find that the ideas of the great social prophets, to whom we have alluded, should have called forth the degree of response that they have actually elicited. What that response has been we shall endeavour to illustrate by some statistical statements before we conclude this article. But first, let us shortly consider what the ideas were in themselves. Essentially they have been embodiments of the conception that the *production and distribution of wealth*, and the general conditions under which it shall be used, should be regulated by the principles by which it has been generally admitted, by all who seriously considered what human conduct ought to be, that this conduct should be regulated in the *use* of the wealth when it had been produced and distributed—namely, by a regard for the claims of other men. In the acquisition of wealth this principle had, with some slight reserve, been practically superseded by the doctrine, that man stands over against his fellow man in the same position in which he stands over against inanimate beings or beings destitute of the faculty of reason, and is justified accordingly in obtaining from them the greatest amount of advantage for himself that his intellectual and physical power enables him to secure. To this assumption, *excused*, if not asserted theoretically, and in practice applied up to whatever limits the general consciousness of humanity embodied in the laws of each country has allowed, the socialist reformers have opposed the principle, that no man ought to take for himself from the labour of other men any advantage in which he does not admit all these co-labourers to share, in proportion to the degree in which they have contributed to produce it. While some have gone beyond this principle to argue that every man should

regard himself as a trustee of all his powers for the benefit of all other men, for whom he should labour without asking for any other benefit than what the general productive powers of the whole body of co-workers may place within the reach of every one. A doctrine, summed up by Louis Blanc in the celebrated formula "De chacun suivant sa capacité, à chacun suivant ses besoins," of which we can only say, that while it expresses the noblest form of voluntary action by those who have more to give than they receive, it would degenerate into selfish tyranny when it was imposed as a law upon other men by those who have more to receive than they could return. Nevertheless the system of communism, which this formula embodies, was adopted by Robert Owen, who concealed from himself the difficulties attending its practical working by the theory that the characters of men are formed by their surroundings; so that a body of men placed under the circumstances of being able to secure an abundant supply of the means of enjoyment, by labour unoppressive to any of them, would, as he conceived, voluntarily fall into the practice of joint labour and common enjoyment.

That this theory was a mistake our readers will probably be very generally disposed to admit; nevertheless it embodies what we conceive to be a most important truth, most essential for the social reformer never to lose sight of—namely, the vast influence of men's surroundings on their characters. The ease with which mankind will insensibly slide into the modes of action adapted to the position in which they find themselves, is the sheet anchor of social hope. In consequence we may feel assured that the unselfish devotion to the common good, required to found institutions capable of expressing this tendency, is an exceptional demand. They do not need for their success an equally unselfish devotion on the part of all those, who must take part in them if they are to be the source of general good. Experience has shown that to secure active exertions in support of a system of society, where the enormous power of modern industry shall really be used to work out the general good, it is necessary only to introduce this system gradually; by institutions fitting in to men's actual habits without any abrupt break, but tending in the direction to which we desire to lead them; and that as these institutions will really give the great body more of the advantages that they chiefly prize than they can generally obtain for themselves under the existing system of struggle, they will rapidly assume the colour of the new atmosphere, till they come to regard as natural a line of conduct which, while they lived in the atmosphere of struggle they would have considered absurd. They will be moralized indirectly, without thinking about it, and drop

vicious practices to their own great benefit; because the surrounding medium does not stimulate their growth. But the communism of Robert Owen was incapable of fulfilling this condition of the gradual substitution of the new society for the old. It is the merit of the great French prophet of Social Reform, Charles Fourier, to have distinctly pointed out the principle on which the dress of a higher order of society can be fashioned, by substituting as the basis of Social Reform the notion of equity for that of equality; replacing the idea of communism, which sacrifices the individual to the body, as our modern individualism sacrifices the body to the individual, by the idea of association where the future and the past are held in an even balance; and giving to this idea of association a development founded on the conception of the unitary home, capable of sustaining the enthusiasm of benevolence by the fascinating picture of social possibilities presented by it to our imaginations; a picture whose fascination has even been detrimental to the success of the system in some of the trials made of it, by leading men to ask from life in association at its first beginning, a succession of pleasures, which only its most matured forms could offer, while, if sought for as the ends of life, they would infallibly pall upon the senses of the seekers. We shall endeavour before the close of this article to give some notion of what this principle of association is capable of effecting by a sketch of what has been effected through its means at Guise in France, by one man with no other resources than those derived from his own inventive and organizing genius. At present we turn to the consideration of what has been done by the application of the same principle in forms less complete, but on that very account admitting of more ready introduction—the two commercial operations of retail and wholesale, supply and credit.

Mr. Holyoake gives, in the first volume of his "History of Co-operation," chapters iv.-ix., a sketch of the origin of the Co-operative Propaganda in Great Britain; of the mills at New Lanark, of which Mr. Owen was the manager, where he began his institution for the formation of character, and built school-rooms—one 90 feet by 40—for the separate instruction of persons from the time when, as infants, they were able to walk alone, till they were intelligent; of the formal opening of the new institution, in 1817, when the difficulties which at first impeded Mr. Owen's plans had been overcome, in the presence of over 2,000 persons, including many of the principal nobility and gentry of the neighbourhood, with some of the clergy of various denominations; of the remarkable success which attended these plans, and the splendid recognition which, in consequence, he

obtained from those highest in position ; of the active propaganda which he instituted to spread his ideas for the reformation of society, with such disregard of cost, that his payments for the newspapers containing an account of his proceedings amounted in four months to £4,000 ("History of Co-operation," p. 60) ; of the enthusiasm for co-operation which his teaching called forth between 1826 and 1830, so that, in the last year, it was estimated that there were nearly 300 co-operative societies of the industrial classes associated through England, Scotland, and Ireland (ii. 153) ; and of the great popularity which, between 1831 and 1883, attended his various attempts to form Labour Exchanges. All this must be taken into account if we would rightly appreciate the rise at Toad Lane, in Rochdale, of that form of co-operation which ultimately succeeded : the plan of selling ordinary articles of consumption at ordinary prices, and returning the surplus of receipts over cost, as a dividend on their purchases, to the purchasers. For though, from various causes into which it would be impossible here to enter in detail, even if the material for examining into them existed—but we believe principally from two causes, one since remedied by the action of the legislature, and the other by the co-operators themselves, the insufficient protection for their property, and the habit of giving credit—these earlier practical efforts almost universally failed ; and though this failure was followed, in 1844, by the break up of the community established at Tytherly, in Hampshire, partly through the combined results of unwise changes of management, and partly from the folly of attempting to build up a new form of society on borrowed money : still, the ideas which had led to these efforts did not perish with the failure of the attempts to give a body to them ; and unquestionably it was by men in whom these ideas lived on, that the Equitable Pioneers Society of Rochdale was founded. It came into being by the aid of men familiarized with the conception of co-operative effort, by the long propaganda carried on during the struggles we have noticed, by Robert Owen himself and the social combatants who fought under his flag. So true is it that, as the late George Eliot wrote, in the fine lines quoted by Mr. Holyoake,

The greatest gift the hero leaves his race  
Is to have been a hero—say we fail ;  
We feed the high traditions of the world  
And leave our spirit in our countries breast.

The programme of the Equitable Pioneers of Rochdale bears clear evidence of the source whence the inspiration of its framers was derived. The objects of the Society when it commenced its

operations with a capital of £28, laboriously scraped together, was stated to be :—

1. The establishing a store for the sale of provisions, clothing, &c. .
2. The building, purchasing, or erecting a number of houses in which members who desire to assist each other in improving their domestic and social condition may reside :
3. To commence the manufacture of such articles as the society may determine upon, for the employment of such members as may be without employment, or who may be suffering in consequence of repeated reductions in their wages :
4. As a further benefit and security to the members of this society, the society shall purchase an estate, or estates in land, which shall be cultivated by the members who may be out of employment, or whose labour may be badly remunerated :
5. That as soon as practicable this society shall proceed to arrange the powers of production, distribution, education and government, or in other words to establish a self-supporting home-colony of united interests, or assist other societies in establishing such colonies.

That men who had formed their society with such lofty aspirations, based only on faith and hope, should have struggled so manfully, as the story of the early days of the Equitable Pioneers told by Mr. Holyoake, shows them to have done, will surprise no one acquainted with the wonders that these tenderest and yet toughest of powers have worked out in other causes. That the result of this faith and hope should have been the great growth of co-operative business which has become prominent of late years, is an illustration of the position previously advanced by us, and forms the strong backbone of trust in the reforming agency of institutions wisely constituted in the view of the general good, and prudently conducted—the position that numbers who would not have thought of forming such institutions, nay who would perhaps have ridiculed as absurd the conception which they embody, are drawn in by their action, when they have been formed, to take part in their operations, and ultimately may become zealous supporters of what they had once been disposed to ridicule or disparage.

At what rate the co-operative store movement actually grew during its earlier period we have no statistics to adduce ; returns exist for particular societies in their own reports, but they were not collected in a form to become generally available till 1862, from which time down to the present we give the statistics of their progress for every five years, classed under the several heads of—

1. Societies making returns.
2. Number of members.
3. Sale of goods during the year.

4. Trade charges :
5. Interest and profit on investments :
6. Balance of profit divisible :
7. Capital—(a) share ; (b) loan :
8. Amount applied for educational purposes.

ENGLAND AND WALES.						
	1862	1867	1872	1877	1882	1883*
1	332	577	749	895	962	922
2	91,502 £	171,897 £	301,157 £	461,666 £	572,610 £	581,384 £
3	2,349,055	6,001,153	11,317,375	18,697,788	22,857,434	23,525,924
4	136,500	311,238	482,607	1,214,734	1,451,648	1,632,684
5	...	...	...	...	100,878	104,122
6	168,302	398,578	809,237	1,658,170	1,788,301	1,928,563
7 <sup>a</sup>	310,731	1,475,199	2,786,955	5,142,958	6,928,172	6,962,182
7 <sup>b</sup>	54,452	136,734	344,509	916,955	1,280,949	1,319,731
8	...	3,606	6,460	†	14,039	14,869
SCOTLAND.						
1			178	224	243	287
2			38,889 £	66,910 £	87,700 £	104,343 £
3	There are no returns for Scotland during these ten years.		1,595,120	2,676,225	3,373,823	4,482,306
4			78,543	158,621	182,585	210,384
5			...	...	27,330	30,176
6			126,314	241,991	322,504	393,570
7 <sup>a</sup>			181,793	345,861	494,735	620,535
7 <sup>b</sup>			27,002	156,310	313,953	372,488
8			235	†	691	885

We think it will be generally admitted that these results are sufficiently remarkable. They show an increase in numbers during the last eleven years of 185 per cent. in England, and of 268 per cent. in Scotland, and a business yielding, on an average of the last year, net profits, after paying £5 per cent. on the total capital employed, of 36 per cent. in Scotland, where the capital is not quite 23 per cent. of the sales ; and of 22 per cent. in England, where the capital bears to the sales the ratio

\* The last year for which the official Returns are published. To prevent misapprehension, we observe that the figures relating to Land and Building Societies are included in these amounts and those for 1882, though they are distinguished in the Registrar's Returns, because these items are so included in the earlier returns, as is still the case in the Scotch Returns ; they are, however, of little importance.

† No return of the sums applied for educational purposes was published in this year.

of 39 per cent. And they appear to show an average annual rate of purchases per member of £40 in England and £43 in Scotland. But these averages require to be modified in different ways by facts, for which the Report to the Co-operative Congress, included among the documents mentioned at the head of this article, supplies the necessary materials.

We see from this report that there exist in England and in Scotland great co-operative wholesale societies, which did businesses with the retail societies during the year 1883, of £4,540,928 and £1,253,154 respectively, and swell the apparent totals of the Registrar's returns by sums really twice counted; since the amount thus sold to the retail societies are sold by them again to their members, with the addition of the retail charges, and returned to the Registrar accordingly. In England a large deduction must be made also for the sales of flour from corn mills, the greater part of whose business, amounting in 1883 to £1,153,678, is done with the retail societies, and thus, as in the case of the wholesale societies, is twice reckoned. Various other deductions, specified in detail in the report, including the sales of certain Civil Service Societies which are comprised in the return, must be made before we arrive at the subject of real interest—the extent to which the population avail themselves of the idea of self-help arising out of association, to carry on in their common interest the business of supplying their own wants. When these deductions have been made, we come to the following results of this retail business in I. England and Wales, and II. Scotland:—

Societies making Returns.	Members.	Sales.	Profits.	Share.	Capital.	Loan.
I. ... 804 ...	543,910 ...	15,637,038 ...	1,779,908 ...	5,878,950 ...	548,302	
II. ... 240 ...	88,014 ...	2,879,465 ...	335,313 ...	517,761 ...	188,203	

They show an average per member:—

	Purchases.			Gains.			Share Capital.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
In England and Wales of ...	26	6	5	...	3	0	0	...	9 17 10
And in Scotland of.....	32	14	2	...	3	14	0	...	5 17 8

Reduced to these individual elements the results may seem small, and, indeed, could not appear otherwise, even if they were extended to the full amount that might be attained if the whole consumption of the working population was supplied by associative union. The importance of this movement as an element in the future elevation of these classes lies in two considerations: first, the moral habit of mind and the intellectual training to which these associations conduce; second, the power of accumulation inherent in the practice of association.



Our subsequent remarks will, we hope, illustrate these propositions. For the present we proceed to notice the second great form of co-operative association which has arisen in Germany, and from Germany has spread into Austria, Belgium, Hungary and Italy, with results considerably greater in regard to the number of societies and the amount of business transacted by them than those shown in Great Britain. German co-operation, which began in the society formed at Delitzsch in 1851 under the advice of the advocate and popular representative, Dr. H. Schulze, whose distinguishing name of Delitzsch is derived from this circumstance, rests upon a conception entirely different from that of England, but adapted to a country abounding in independent proprietors and artisans\*—namely, union to obtain by their joint action the credit which they could not hope to secure individually, and thus reduce that heavy burden of interest which weighed so oppressively on the shoulders of the smaller producer in his competition with the wealthier manufacturer. Started, at first, only as associations for buying wholesale the materials required by some especial class of workers to whom they should be sold at moderate prices, the institution soon assumed as its ordinary type the form of banks, to make advances generally for any kind of business, under the conditions which Schulze-Delitzsch repeated in every one of his annual reports, and his successor still preserves.

Self-help [says this statement] in relation to the wants of ready money in their trade or households by those who have to ordinary banking accommodation, either no access, or access only under burdensome conditions, is brought into action in our societies thus—

1. That the man who asks for an advance shall himself sustain and take part in the institution set on foot to satisfy his needs; that is, shall be a member of the bank, and participate in the risk and the profit.

2. That the dealings in money transacted through the means of the bank shall always be ordered on a business footing (service for service), so that interest at the bank rate and provisions according to the relations of the gold market, shall be paid from the funds of the society to the creditors, and to these funds by those to whom advances are made; and that a suitable payment for their trouble shall be made to the supervisors and the officials in charge of the money.

3. That either by immediate payments in full, or more commonly by the gradual continuous contributions of the members, shares in the business shall be built up in the funds of the society, and that the net profits shall be divided, according to the amount of these contributions, until they reach some fixed nominal sum, so that there

---

\* Dr. Schneider, a Member of the Imperial Diet, states that, according to the trade statistics of the German Empire, there were in it, in 1882, 245,118 independent hand-workers in the shoe trade alone.

shall be created for the society a continually growing capital of its own as is done by means of shares.

4. That, in addition, there shall be formed, by entrance fees of the members and shares of profit, a collective property of the society, as a reserve for the especial purpose of covering large losses.

5. That all other money required for the vigorous carrying on of the business shall be obtained as loans on the common credit, and under the unlimited responsibility of all the members.

6. Finally that the number of members shall be unlimited, and admission to the society be open to all who satisfy the general conditions of its statutes; and that, similarly, every one shall be at liberty to withdraw under reservation of certain fixed notices.

Such are the principles of the Schulze-Delitzsch banks. We regret that space does not allow us to quote at length the arguments by which he shows, what experience has fully borne out, that by unions formed upon these principles the workers would produce among their richer neighbours an amount of confidence which would bring them in by loans and deposits ample funds for carrying on their active operations, and building up through this means a capital for themselves. The results attained in Germany by the institutions thus formed, or which have grown out of modifications of this idea in the thirty-three years elapsed since the first society was founded at Delitzsch, appear from the official report for 1883 of the great union formed among these societies, of which the head, with the title of Anwalt, was Dr. Schulze-Delitzsch during his life, and is now Herr F. Schenck.

The report contains the names and addresses of

I. People's Banks . . . . .	1910
II. Consumers' Societies . . . . .	675
III. Industrial Societies—	
a. For the supply of raw materials to 16 different classes of workers . . . . .	141
b. For the sale of articles produced by 12 different classes of workers . . . . .	59
c. For production in 26 different kinds of work . . . . .	145 — 345
IV. Agricultural Societies—	
a. For the supply of raw material . . . . .	305
b. For the supply of implements . . . . .	98
c. For stock raising . . . . .	73
d. For the sale of agricultural products . . . . .	5
e. For production in—	
(1) Dairying . . . . .	170
(2) Six other kinds of produce . . . . .	28—198 — 679
Carried forward . . . . .	3609

	Brought forward . . . . .	3609
V. Assurance Societies . . . . .		14
VI. Building Societies . . . . .		33
VII. Various other objects, including 5 societies of chimney sweepers and 7 of homœopathists . . . . .		32
		<hr/> 3688

Of this long list reports had been received from 1,128 societies only—namely, 922 banks, 172 consumers' societies, and 34 industrial and agricultural societies. But from these, and probably from other sources of information which may be at the command of the Anvalt, though not assuming the character of definite reports, he gives the following estimates :—

The number of members of the societies . . . . .	1,200,000
The capital of their own . . . . .	£10,000,000
„ „ borrowed . . . . .	£22,500,000 — £32,500,000
„ business done during the year . . . . .	£100,000,000

Such have been the results of the co-operative idea for the German empire only. The Austrian empire yields an addition, not indeed comparable either in the number of societies or in the number of their respective members to those of the German empire, but still far from inconsiderable. The Report for 1881, published by Herr H. Ziller, who has rendered to Austrian co-operation the same sort of service that Schulze-Delitzsch rendered to co-operation in Germany, enumerates in the Austrian empire proper :—

I. People's Banks . . . . .	1129
II. Consumers' Societies . . . . .	235
III. Industrial Societies—	
a. For the supply of raw material . . . . .	6
b. „ „ sale of goods . . . . .	3
c. „ „ production in 20 different kinds of work. . . . .	41 — 50
IV. Agricultural Societies—	
a. For the supply of materials or other aids to cultivation . . . . .	14 *
b. For production—in	
(1) Dairying . . . . .	59
(2) Other kinds of produce . . . . .	2 — 75
V. Assurance Societies . . . . .	2
VI. Building Societies . . . . .	5
VII. Societies for various objects . . . . .	19
Total . . . . .	1515

Hungary, according to the same Report, adds :-

I. People's Banks . . . . .	808
II. Consumers' Societies . . . . .	16
III. Industrial Societies—	
<i>a.</i> For the supply of raw materials . . . . .	2
<i>b.</i> „ „ sale of goods . . . . .	3
<i>c.</i> „ „ production . . . . .	6 — 11
IV. Agricultural Societies—	
<i>a.</i> For aids to cultivation . . . . .	2
<i>b.</i> For production . . . . .	7 — 9
V. Assurance Societies . . . . .	8
VI. Societies for various objects . . . . .	5
Total	357

The pecuniary results attained in Austria and Hungary Herr Ziller does not attempt to estimate, as a whole, and the returns are imperfect. But the following comparison of German and Austrian Banks is not without interest :—

	Germany.		Austria.	
	Actual Totals.	Average.	Actual Totals.	Average.
Societies .....	922 ...	...	743* ..	...
Members.....	466,575 ...	506	296,648 ..	425
	£	£		£
Shares .....	5,218,678 11	5,551	2,041,514 2	2,747 0
Reserve .....	970,379 17	1,652	531,465 0	715 0
Loans .....	19,467,963 19	21,115	12,827,827 6	17,251 0
Business in year	75,685,863 17	82,088	17,023,791 12	22,913 12
Net profits .....	418,868 15	8 p.c. on shares.	188,908 16	9 p.c. on shares.

For Italy we have, in the Report of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, official information of the progress and present state of the People's Banks, originally introduced and diffused in that country by the untiring and able advocacy of Luigi Luzzati, Member of the Italian Parliament, though with an important modification of the scheme of his master, Schulze-Delitzsch, which has also been extensively adopted in Austria—namely, the limitation of the responsibility of the members to the capital that they have agreed to subscribe.

The following figures taken from the Report show that the importance attached by Schultze-Delitzsch to the character of unlimited responsibility, however well founded it may have been at the first formation of People's Banks in Germany, is certainly not requisite to insure their progress in other countries at the present time :—

\* In the case of the members the average is on 695 societies only.

Year.	Number of Banks.	Capital. Share & Reserve.	Deposits.	Net Profits.
1865	4	£	£	
1870	50	496,880	1,307,420	
1875	109	1,694,720	4,586,320	
1880	140	2,024,100	7,195,920	
1883	250	2,685,720	10,456,840	462,868

(Statement of Dr. Ugo Rabbeno, Report to Congress, p. 102.)

The profits are £16 17s. 5d. per cent. on the whole capital share and reserve, or deducting £551,408 for the reserve, £22 15s. per cent. on the shares paid up; a rate considerably greater than that shown by the German banks above mentioned, and due, apparently, according to the amount given in the introduction to the official Report, to the very high rates customary in certain districts; whence it has even been necessary to advance cautiously in the reduction of interest by the People's Banks, lest they should defeat their own objects by preventing the flow of deposits, from the desire of the depositors to obtain a larger profit by letting their money be employed through private channels. In the great People's Bank of Milan, which in 1883 had a turnover of £69,343,540, the net profit was only, on its share capital, £305,664, or at the rate of £16 11s. per cent., and on its share and reserve together at the rate of £11 3s. 10d.—£498,960 in the whole, of which £2,693 16s. was allotted to its *employes*.

Italy is, however, not confined in its co-operative work to institutions for facilitating credit, of which in that country, as also in Germany by what are called the Raiffeisen Banks, attempts have recently been made to extend the advantages to the classes of smaller landed proprietors or farmers. The report by Dr. Ugo Rabbeno (p. 101 of the Congress Report cited at the head of this article), mentions several forms of Italian Consumers' Societies, and various Productive Societies, both industrial and agricultural, including two peculiar forms of co-operation, to which we regret that we cannot spare more space—(1) the co-operative bakeries set on foot by Don Rinaldo Anelli, priest of Bernato Ticino, a village in Lower Lombardy, as a remedy against a horrible disease called the pellagra, by which the agricultural labourers were afflicted from the ill-baked, unwholesome bread which was their principal food; (2) the unions formed among the *braccianti*—a class who seem to correspond very much to our navvies—to contract for doing earthworks on their own account; with the result, as stated by Dr. Rabbeno, that while unassociated workers did not earn on an average more than from 80c. to 1.50 lire (7½d. to 1s. 2½d.) a day, the associates have reached 3, 4, and even 5 lire (2s. 5d., 3s. 2½d., and 4s. a day; partly because they had got rid of middlemen, and partly because, being directly interested in the work, they themselves worked with increased industry.

We have traced in large outlines the progress of the co-operative movement on the Continent, in Germany, in Austria, in Hungary, and in Italy. But the growth of the spirit and practice of association is not confined to these countries and Great Britain. In Belgium the *Statistica della Banche Popolari*, cited above, gives (page 14) a list of eighteen People's Banks, which at the end of 1881 had

Members.	Capital. Share.	Reserve.	Current Accounts. Debtor.	Creditor.	Commercial Securities.
10,413	... £79,346	... £5,643	... £166,942	... £46,316	... £147,694

Switzerland, again, according to an account taken from the *Journal de Genève* of March 6, 1884, to be found on page 108 of the Congress Report, cited above, had at that time 121 Consumers' Societies, distributed over seventeen States, of which all but nine were founded since 1860. They had made the following returns of capital and business:—

Capital of 109 Societies.			Business of 85 Societies.	
Shares.	Reserve.	Loan.	Sales.	
£60,981	..... £28,801	..... £19,236	..... £519,530	

In the course of the year ten new societies are said to have been formed, while one had gone into liquidation.

In Sweden also, we gather from the same Report (page 107), that a system of combined co-operative action is being brought into operation on a large scale by Mr. Lars Oscar Smith, who anticipates the possibility, through an improved system of cookery introduced by him, of reducing the cost of living by about 40 per cent.

In the United States of North America, where a great concurrence of evidence shows the rapid growth of the conviction, that the social evils under which the world of Europe groans are coming upon them with a giant's stride, notwithstanding the vast extent of fertile land, easily accessible, still open to the settler, and although the political institutions, which many among ourselves are apt to hold out as a remedy for social evils, exist in full vigour among them, we find, from the accounts contained in the Congress Report, pp. 81–83, that the minds of thoughtful men are widely turning to the idea of association as the only way that offers a prospect of effectually and permanently escaping from these evils, and placing the mass of the population in living conditions, worthy of the programme that the founders of the great Western Republic set before themselves.

France we have reserved mention of to the last, because it offers the most perfect instance hitherto given of what associated life may be, if the practice of it becomes "thorough." France,

though it cannot rival Germany or Italy in its People's Banks, which are barely known there, or Great Britain in its Consumers' Societies, though these have now become sufficiently numerous to entertain the project of a Central Commercial Union, connected with a central propagandist body, and held a Congress at Paris in July last, in order to inaugurate such centres, is much ahead of Great Britain in the disposition to form associations of working men for self-employment; and still more ahead both of Germany and Great Britain in institutions emanating from the side of the employers, by which the antagonism between the employer and the employed may be removed, and the heads of great industrial establishments assume their proper character of captains of industry, the acknowledged leaders of the peaceful armies of labour in promoting the well-being of mankind. The Congress Report, above cited, contains on page 96, a list, recently published by the Bureau des Associations Professionnelles at the French Ministry of the Interior, of 74 Co-operative Productive Societies, in forty-six different kinds of work, now existing at Paris, some of them of many years standing, with £307,482 of nominal, and £219,543 of paid-up capital, 4,930 associates, and a total of work done since their establishment of £3,563,927. Not less remarkable is the list, published in the "Bulletin" of the Society for promoting participation in profits, cited at the head of this article, of the firms where this system of solving the dispute between capital and labour has been introduced. It contains a list of 98 firms or companies, including 49 in France of which 31 are at Paris, 18 in Germany, 12 in Switzerland, 8 in England, and 1 each in Alsace, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Hungary, Italy, Norway, Russia, and Sweden, where the workers are admitted more or less fully to participate in the profit of the business; upon systems which in twenty-three cases had been in operation prior to 1870, and in thirty-three others had been introduced between 1870 and 1880, so that they have an experience of some years. To the satisfactory results produced at Paris a striking evidence was borne by the employers, on the recent Parliamentary Commission of Inquiry into Working Men's Associations held there. "I have been struck," says M. Waldeck Rousseau, the then Minister of the Interior, and President of the Commission, in an address delivered to it, February 2, 1885, "by the decision with which the most experienced employers have declared that, by establishing in their firms the participation in profits, they had not only done a good action but made a good stroke of business. You will find this affirmation on the lips of all whom you have heard. The labour, the

co-operation which they obtain is more efficient, more productive. We are, they said, amply repaid for the sacrifice we have made by the devoted co-help that we obtain.”\*

Now, as the way in which the participation is regulated in these establishments is very various, it may be reasonably inferred, that in order to remove the strain apt to arise between employer and employed where the relation between them is only one of wage contract, almost any system by which a substantial share in the profits of the business is secured to the workers by the constitution of the institution is sufficient. But the cessation of this strained relation, desirable as it is in itself, is far from accomplishing all that the present enormous development of productive power ought, we think, to be able to do; and what the example we are about to cite shows that it might do for permanently raising the position of the present worker, without denying to the past, rolled up, work that we call capital the share of advantage reasonably belonging to it.

At Guise, in the department de l’Aisne, there is an iron foundry where, at the date of its last balance-sheet, published in October, 1884, there were employed 1,450 persons in the manufacture of stoves and various other articles of hardware, created in the course of the last forty years by the genius and energy of M. Godin, the son of a blacksmith in the adjoining village of Esque’he’ries. In 1880 M. Godin converted this business into a society \* under the French Law of Commandite for ninety-nine years, with a power of prolongation and an original capital of £184,000, all contributed by M. Godin, with the exception of £6,880 arising out of shares of profit previously allotted by him to certain of his employés. Of this society M. Godin is Gerant for life, with the power of nominating his successor, who, if not thus nominated, is to be appointed by election of an élite body of workers called the associés, and in either case is removable by a process of a judicial character well adapted to prevent cabal. The body of associés is recruited by election at their own general meetings, from applicants possessing, beside the condition of irreproachable morals and conduct, which are required of every member of the association, the following qualifications:—(1) To be twenty-five years of age; (2 and 3), to have worked for the association and resided in the associated dwellings, called the Familistère, for at least five years; (4), to be able to read and write; and (5) to hold at least £20 in the capital of the association. Originally there were sixty-eight associés, nomi-

\* See Report of Congress, cited above, p. 88.

† Called “La Société du Familistère de Guise, Association Co-operative du Capital et du Travail sous la Raison Social Godin et Cie.”



nated by M. Godin from workers who had been in his employment for ten, twenty, even twenty-five years and upwards, and by their ability and industry had materially contributed to build up the fortune consecrated by him : in his own words "to give the world an example of the possibility of social harmony arising from the alliance of interest according to the laws of life." They had increased in 1884 to seventy-four. But they are an élite body, the natural aristocracy of the working population of the Familistère, who form three categories beneath the associés, of II. Sociétaires, III. Participants, and IV. Auxiliaires,\* and thus constitutes in the sphere of industry that *carrière ouverte aux talents*, which the first Napoleon held to be the meaning of the French Revolution, here converted into the minister of the bloodless revolution, that organized industry may work out by the magic of voluntary association. This career is opened to the body of workers generally, through the regulations relating to the application of the profits which are thus divided.

From the gross profits appearing on the balance-sheet there are deducted :—

1. As depreciation fund, a sum equal to 10 per cent. on the value of the stock, 5 per cent. on that of the materials.

2. As contribution to a fund for providing pensions for age or injury in the works, or allowances for any cases where the total earnings of a family does not exceed a scale fixed by the statutes, varying from an allowance of 2½*d.* a day to one of 1*s.* 1½*d.*, a sum equal to 2 per cent. on the total salaries and wages.

3. Any sums which may be voted to make up a deficiency in the assurance funds, against sickness, and for the supply of medicine which are supported by contributions from the wages and salaries of the employés.

4. A sum of not less than £1,000, but which in the year 1884 was £1,343 18*s.*, for the cost of the nursery and schools.

5. Interest at 5 per cent. on the capital of the association for the time being, which is considered to be "the wages" of capital.

6. The remainder is divided as follows :—

---

\* In 1884 the numbers of these bodies respectively were: Sociétaires, 148; Participants, 574; Auxiliaires, 656. The Sociétaires and Participants are admitted by the Gerant and Conseil de Gerance from persons twenty-one years of age, and free from the obligation of military service, who have worked for the association for at least one year in the case of a Participant and three years in that of a Sociétaire, who must also live in the palace. The Auxiliaires are not members of the association, but only workers employed by it, who, however, may be admitted to live in the Familistère and then become qualified for admission as Sociétaires. The Association includes also holders of capital who are not workers, called Interesses, who, however, have no share in the management.

	Per cent.
a. To the Administrateur Gerant . . . . .	12
b. „ „ Administrative Councils . . . . .	11
c. „ „ Reward of Exceptional Services . . . . .	2
d. To Reserve until this is equal to one-tenth of the capital of the Association, and then to a division as next aftermentioned . . . . .	25
e. To a division ratably on the wages of capital (see 5) and those of work, subject to the qualifications . . . . .	50

(1.) That the associés participate for twice and the Sociétaires for once and a half the amount of their earnings.

(1.) That the share of the Auxiliaires is carried to the Assurance Fund, in the benefits of which they participate.

The results attained by the Association, during the five years intervening between its formal institution and 1884, the following figures taken from its balance-sheets show :—

Total salaries and wages paid . . . . .	£364,000
Total profits earned . . . . .	213,640
Distribution of profits :—	
To depreciation and reserve . . . . .	£53,560
„ assurance fund . . . . .	31,620
„ nursery and schools . . . . .	5,320
„ interest on capital . . . . .	51,280
„ the administrator Gerant . . . . .	13,320
„ the administrative Councils . . . . .	14,160
„ special services (inventions) . . . . .	2,200
„ associés . . . . .	7,960
„ sociétaires . . . . .	5,880
„ participants . . . . .	22,160
„ workers participating on various accounts . . . . .	6,200
	<hr/> 213,640

<sup>1</sup> See above.

But to convey an idea of the working of the Association we must observe that of this large sum the only portion directly paid away was the £46,000 of interest on capital. All the remaining profits, except the reserved and depreciation fund, have, by the rules of the Association, been converted into capital, credited to the various persons entitled to them, and, not being required for the extension of the business, have been applied to replace the original foundation capital, of which the balance-sheet of 1884 showed £78,770 4s. 10d. to be credited to the accumulation of profit, and £17,990 0s. 2d. to the assurance fund, leaving £105,229 15s. 2d. only remaining to the account of the founder's capital.

At the same period the different assurance funds above mentioned showed the following results :—

\* “Le Devoir,” the official organ of the Association, 1884, p. 706.

Funds.	Receipts.			Payments.			Balance.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
A. Pensions and allowances...	2,275	15	4 ...	1,982	5	1 ...	27,380	13	3
B. Sick relief (a) men ...	1,785	11	0 ...	1,427	12	11 ...	361	10	8
(b) women ...	224	8	11 ...	194	7	9 ...	178	12	2
C. Medical necessities ...	182	18	5 ...	259	13	8 ...	84	4	8

It will be seen that, with exception of C, where there is a small excess, more than covered by the previous balance, of expenditure over receipts, all these funds are in a prosperous position. The amount of benefit afforded by them appears from the next statement.

A had paid during the year forty-six pensions and given aid to seventy-four families.

B and C had provided sick pay, medical attendance and medicine for 14,496 days of illness of 642 men, and 4,640 days of illness of 129 women.

Now, of the mode here explained of dealing with profits, we must observe, (1) that it cuts up by the roots the common objection to the admission of the worker to participate in them, that they do not participate in losses; (2) that it provides a cure for that cancer of modern industry, the antagonism between the past work which makes present work possible, and the present work which makes past work fruitful; (3) that it secures to a far greater extent than the present system the accumulation of this past work, called capital. Let us examine these propositions. In a prosperous business it is clear that the foundation capital would be rapidly paid off by the accumulated profits, which would gradually convert the workers into the proprietors of the source of their pay. And it would keep this instrument of production the property of the actual workers; since the process of paying off the capital which cannot be profitably employed in the extension of the business, originally applied to the foundation capital continues in respect to the accumulated profits. The holders would be paid off in the order of the dates of the shares allotted to them.

Clearly, then, there could be no antagonism between work and capital, since the capital would be held by those who were doing the work. Also if the business incurs any loss, this loss will have to be supported by the workers whom it has raised into capitalists. At the same time the whole of the actual profits above 5 per cent. dividend on the capital, not merely so much as the individual proprietor may choose thus to apply, is in all events accumulated and employed, if it can be advantageously employed in the business. While the worker who is paid off, having learnt, during the period when the converted profits of his work were year by year bringing to him a revenue, the lesson of the value of capital, will usually be

disposed, if his turn to be paid off arrives, to seek for this capital in some other productive investment a source of revenue not inferior if possible to his past experience.

M. Godin has thus given an example, eminently successful in its working, of the way in which the profits of manufacture may be dealt with so as, while they benefit most those who most require to be benefited, to secure for the more fortunate class a share in the profits they help to produce by the use of their capital. But he has done much more in the way of industrial reform, by the construction of the social palace, which, to use his own words, "is destined to place at the service of the poor the advantages of wealth."

The visitor to Guise passes, on his way from the station to the town, between two vast blocks of buildings, each four storeys high, standing in a free space of several acres, partly laid out as gardens, and with a range of lower buildings opposite to the larger of these blocks, which, like many old English mansions, consists of a receding centre, flanked by two projecting wings. These buildings with a small addition in an adjoining street form the "Familistère." If the visitor enters this central building, he will find himself in a hall about 140 feet long by 68 deep, excellently ventilated, floored with cement, covered by a vast glazed roof, and communicating with two similarly floored and glazed halls by passages at the corners of the side on which he enters. At each of these corners is a broad circular staircase, which communicates, on every storey with a projecting balcony extending round each of these halls, and forming on every floor a continuous communication for all the rooms, completely protected from the weather. These apartments are double, an inner room with a window looking into the hall, and an outer room with a window looking upon the surroundings of the Familistère. They contain large closets and entrance porches, and are so arranged that they may be occupied in suites of two, three, four or five rooms, according to the size and resources of the occupiers; of whom each is free within his own domain; as much separated from his neighbours as are the occupiers of adjoining houses; and far less exposed to prying observation than are the residents in our ordinary streets. In the passages, at the corners of the halls, are placed the arrangements for disposing of the refuse, and for other domestic conveniences, including an ample supply of water. Shops, containing all ordinary necessities, occupy one side of the ground floor in the central hall. A library and reading-room, and a casino are comprised in one of the wings. In the buildings opposite there is a buvette and a restaurant where food may be cooked for those who have not women folk to cook their food at home.

And across a bridge over the Oise, which encircles the palace, and divides it from the foundry, are baths and wash-houses, with an ample supply of cold and hot water.

All these advantages, and those greater educational ones to be next mentioned, the inmate of the Familistère enjoys by paying for his rooms, at a rate varying according to their size and situation, of from 14c. to 23c. (1·324*d.* to 2·206*d.*) per day.\* For this the occupier obtains a room plastered and whitewashed. Any internal decoration must be done at his own cost and according to his own taste. But these payments, it must be borne in mind, are part of the revenues in which, as a member of the association, he shares, and he has no other expenses. The cost of cleaning, lighting, repairs, and assurance, which, in 1880, when only the centre and east wing of the Familistère was occupied, was £405 8s., and the four direct taxes, which amounted in that year to £64 13s. 7*d.*, the Association bears, and it provides a free education for his children at an expense which, as we have seen, in five years amounted to £5,320, and in the year 1883-4 was, as has been said, £1,343 18s.

This educational provision commences from the beginning. An admirably arranged *crèche*, situated immediately behind the central building, receives the children of the inhabitants as soon as the mothers are able to bring them, if they choose to leave them there, and retains them for as many hours as the mothers leave them, till they are able to walk. Then they pass into an adjoining babies' school, or Kindergarten, where the first beginnings of instruction commence, by the half-play, half-lesson with which we have of late become familiar in these schools; though few of them, we apprehend, can offer the healthy and pleasant surroundings provided for the tender human plants growing up at Guise, in the open balconies and encircling lawns round their *crèche* and babies' school, where the little ones, in fine weather, spend the greater part of the day, under the watchful supervision of kind nurses and teachers. An infant school in two classes carries on the education of the children from 3½ to 5 and 5 to 6½ years, when, to the number at the present time of about twenty-five annually, they enter the regular schools as pupils able to read at sight from easy lesson books, furnished with the elementary notions of arithmetic,

---

\* The charge is per square mètre per month: on the ground floor and second floor, 26c.; first floor, 27c.; third, 23c.; and attic or cellar, 10c.; but the rooms looking to the town let 2c. per square mètre higher than those looking over the country. The rent of two rooms 11ft. 5in. by 14ft. 8in., and 12ft. 1in. by 14ft. 9in., and a closet 3ft. by 4ft. 10in., is, per month, on the ground and third floor, 7s. 8*d.*; the first floor, 8s. 7*d.*; and the third floor, 6s. 9*d.*—9·60, 10·75, and 8·40frs. respectively.

beginning to write, and in many cases to draw, and with minds already stored to some extent with useful knowledge. In this state they offer an excellent material for the proper school teaching, which is carried on in five successive classes, up to the age of fourteen, and in the case of those who show superior abilities, of fifteen or sixteen years. No pupil is admitted to any class until it is ascertained by examination that he or she can properly follow the lessons given it; while the unitary dwelling, among its many other advantages, brings the important gain of ensuring, except in the case of illness, regularity of attendance, from the immediate vicinity of the schools to the Familistère, and the impossibility of any child playing truant without immediate discovery.

Such, in large outlines, is the Familistère of Guise. We must deny ourselves the temptation to enlarge upon the possibilities, suggested by such an institution, of applying an effectual remedy to our present social evils, by directing the stream of industrial industry back from the ever-growing deserts of our over-peopled cities to the country, now ever growing unpeopled, through the attractions of a life which associated homes, connected at once with manufacturing and agricultural enterprise, might render as full of pleasing variety as it was rich in productive work. To do more than touch upon a subject of this magnitude would require a space that we have not at command. But we must touch upon it so far as to indicate the vast possibilities that do lie in this direction, in the hope of thus leading some of those, especially in this country, who have the welfare of mankind at heart, to take in the ideas of co-operative association, an interest which at present we think that they do not generally feel, as they would do if they rightly appreciated these possibilities.

The numerous bodies of the working population, who, as we have seen, are now busying themselves about co-operation under its separate forms would, we are persuaded, furnish a splendid material to any leaders of social reform who would take up the far reaching, yet essentially practical, conceptions of such a man as Godin. The desire for a more complete bond of unity than the separate societies can supply has shown itself both in Great Britain, Germany and Italy by the co-operative unions for common consultation and joint propaganda organized in each of these countries, but especially perfected in Germany, where the general union rests upon thirty-three distinct provincial or state unions, each of which holds a local congress of the societies belonging to it in addition to the general diet. It is shown also in the formation of commercial centres, such as the two great wholesale societies in England and Scotland noticed above, and the central bank of Soergel, Parrisius & Co. at Berlin.

But these unions manifest rather than satisfy the disposition whence they have arisen. They point to something more perfect than the present forms of co-operative action, but they do not indicate fully what this more perfect form should be. This conception can be attained only when we pass from the simple creation or distribution of wealth to its employment; from the associated workshop, or farm, or store, to the associated home. Herein lies the vast importance of M. Godin's work—the field which the leaders of social reform, whom we hope that the classes most amply provided with knowledge and wealth will produce in numbers proportioned to the greatness of the work to be done, will find the most productive of valuable results. In our own country the organized bodies of artisan consumers, from the profits in their own consumption, which at present cause them the unwonted embarrassment of having more capital than they know how to deal with, could, and we believe would, supply abundant resources for the use of any such leaders who, by their superior intelligence or position, should open their eyes, by a few striking examples, to what they might do for raising their own position, if they pass from the ambition of realizing two shilling to two shilling and sixpenny dividends on their own purchases, or the dream of building, by laborious savings, little cells, all their own, in the prisons to which competitive struggle dooms them, to the idea of creating a true associated life in the fulness of a Familistèrian Home. We fear that, unaided by such leaders, unstimulated by such examples, they will not, or not for a long season, do what, under this guidance, they might learn to do soon and effectually. Co-operative action is even now a great fact. The statistics that we have adduced prove it. But it stops far short of its logical development. The future we are satisfied belongs to it. But it is a possession which can be appropriated only in proportion as the co-operators learn to be "thorough," and complement associations for consumption, for credit, and for production in agriculture or manufactures, by the crowning association where all the other forms will be summed up and included—the associated home, the social palaces of the united workers, cultivators, and consumers.

---

## ART. II.—THE SOPHOCLEAN DRAMA.

1. *Sophocles: the Plays and Fragments, with Critical Notes, Commentary and Translation in English Prose.* By R. C. JEBB, M.A., LL.D. Part I. *The Œdipus Tyrannus.* 8vo. Cambridge University Press. 1883.
2. *The Plays and Fragments of Sophocles.* Edited, with English Notes and Introductions, by LEWIS CAMPBELL, M.A., LL.D., Professor of Greek in the University of St. Andrews. 8vo. Clarendon Press, Oxford. 1866-81.
3. *Euripides Restitutus, sive Scriptorum Euripidis ingenique censura, &c.* J. A. HARTUNGUS. Hamburgi. 1843.

WHEN we pass in review all the literature which has come down to us from antiquity, we think it will be generally admitted that the Greek tragic drama, taken in its entirety, is by far the richest and most interesting relic. It has the advantage over the Homeric epic in the circumstance of its consisting of a series of productions of the most finished character, executed according to certain recognized canons of art, and written in an age of culture for a critical and fastidious audience. The subjects of these dramas, moreover, are singularly impressive as regards the story or legend on which they are founded, and the various incidents are presented in the most striking point of view purposely to enlist the sympathies of the reader or spectator. We put aside for the moment all consideration of the choral, evolutionary and scenic associations, though these adjuncts—now for ever lost—constituted in themselves no unimportant medium for swaying the imagination and sustaining the interest of the audience. In measuring the effect on ourselves of the charm produced by the reading of a Greek play, we must remember that we are readers only, and not spectators, and we are therefore bound to confess that our pleasure would have been infinitely greater could we have witnessed their representation with all their majestic surroundings. Further, we must not forget that the dramas we now possess were most of them prize poems reserved for publicity during one of the most honoured festivals of Athens, and constituted no slight portion of the interest which attracted a vast crowd from every part of Greece, and even from foreign States. An Athenian audience in the days of Sophocles sat as critics, and only admitted a drama for representation on the stage when it was pronounced, af

[Vol. CXXIV. No. CCXLVIII.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LXVIII. No.



severe competition, to be the most eligible. The difference, therefore, between what are called the Poems of Homer and the Greek tragic dramas lies mainly in the fact that the latter were essentially artistic works which challenged criticism on principle; while the former, being composed long before the canons of art were dreamt of, could only claim any merit on that score through the exercise of the unpremeditated taste and judgment of the composer. But the drama had likewise its attractions from its composite character, being at once an oral, a musical, and a scenic exhibition. There was also either more or less of mystery associated with the representation, and the beings of the tragic stage always remained strange enigmas to the audience until the poet chose to unlock the secret. The Homeric rhapsodist, however gifted, could not pretend to wield such varied resources. However lofty his intention, his method was simple and artless. He was only a bard, migrating from place to place, who chanted his verses to rude and unlettered listeners, who were no critics as to style or diction, and who were content if they were stirred for the moment by recitals of heroism which roused their enthusiasm or flattered the national vanity. In truth, it is obvious that we judge of these respective compositions by an entirely different standard—rigorously in the case of the drama, but making allowances for any defects or shortcomings in the epic. The birth of art in literary composition, properly understood, took place, in our opinion, when the *competitive* stimulus was first instituted, and the Odes of Pindar and his predecessors, which won the prize at the Olympic or Isthmian Games, may be said to be the earliest examples extant in the Greek language of the employment of the artistic method. All that partakes of art is either more or less of a premeditated effort, and is executed in strict conformity to rules: hence the existence of such rules, either tacitly or declared, must be admitted, as the judges otherwise could have pronounced no opinion on the merits of the compositions presented to them. The canons of art were, no doubt, brought to bear on the Homeric Poems in the process of collecting, arranging, and committing them to writing; but in their original conception they were certainly destitute of any such marks of finish, and perhaps we even value them the more in proportion as we see the absence of all premeditation. The Poems of Homer, regarded as “the Bible of the Ancients,” will always stand apart as venerable beyond all comparison, not only as marking the first crowning triumphs of the language, but from the vast store of information they afford regarding the sentiment and manners of the Hellenic race in the remotest times. They have also been the mine out of which the dramatists extracted many of their richest products. But

apart from the aspect of archaic grandeur they exhibit, it would be unreasonable to claim for them the excellence which lies in the elaboration of the more subtle and transcendent powers of which the intellect is capable. That supreme place, we hold, can only be accorded after a certain period of social progression, and when a nation has touched the highest point in its career and even verges towards decline. It is surely a vast intellectual advance on the epic when the author can conceive a language for the several characters such as they might naturally have used, when he can lay open their secret thoughts and present to us the analysis as if he possessed the very key. Not only, therefore, is the artistic effect and the ethical moral purpose more fully worked out in the drama, but we get an exhibition of pathos far more intense, and our sympathies are more violently roused by the deeper introspection of the human heart undertaken by the dramatist. It is one thing to have a rough outline in a block of marble, and another to behold that block fashioned into a form to which nothing can be superadded. Now, to our idea, the Greek tragic drama finds its representation in the latter example. It has all the sublimity and interest of the epic, but it has also something more—something which, for want of a better term, we would call artistic finish. Both the epic poet and the dramatist have, in many instances, adopted the same themes for illustration, and we maintain that the work of the dramatist is frequently grander, nobler, more pathetic in its conception and treatment than that of the epic poet. While we recognize in the productions of the drama the expansive force of art and the experiences of a more complicated civilization, we have likewise an emotional interest awakened within us which the epic hardly touches; for pathos, which is the soul of tragedy, is nowhere so varied or so expressive as on the stage.\* Taken in their entirety, then, the works of Æschylus, Sophocles and Euripides constitute a repertoire which is certainly without a rival in Greek literature—perhaps we might even say, without a rival in any literature, whether ancient or modern. Draughts of character the most natural and truthful, just and appropriate sentiments in a language which is at once majestic, flexible and familiar, are the unfailing characteristics of the Homeric poems; but in the Greek tragedy we find all the qualities peculiar to the epic, and we discover likewise the exhibition of a more subtle mental energy which gives to the latter work a distinctive intellectual place.

---

\* Æschines, himself an actor, refers in his speech against Ctesiphon to the tears shed at the theatrical representations:—*πλείω δάκρυα ἀφῆσεν ἐπὶ ταῖς τραγωδίαις καὶ τοῖς ἡρώικοις πάθεσι.*

We are well aware that we are affirming a hazardous proposition, which is certain to be combated, not only on grounds of good taste, but even on grounds of comparative merit; and that a good many will be prepared to maintain that the drama, as compared with the older epic, is either more or less an artificial and factitious production, and for that very reason deserves to take inferior rank—nay, that the very absence of these adventitious resources, from which the epic is entirely free, confers on it a simplicity and a verity not to be found in the other. The controversy, we admit, is one not easily disposed of, and if instituted in a deliberate spirit, might possibly call forth as many champions on the one side as the other. All we care to affirm, as introductory to our present subject, is, that the Greek tragic drama—mutilated and abridged as it is of its former grand proportions—is a matchless production in a literary point of view, and our admiration of it in no respect tends to diminish our interest in the more archaic relic. Aristotle, almost a contemporary of Sophocles, and no inglorious critic on this ground, when he proceeds after his formal fashion to institute a comparison between the two, shows no blind bigotry for Homer; for he boldly affirms that tragic poetry is superior to the epic, inasmuch as “it possesses all that the epic contains; and that although all parts of the epic are to be found in tragedy, we cannot say that all parts of tragedy are to be found in the epic.” He shows the force which the drama derives from unity and compression; and concludes by enunciating the principle we contend for—namely, that “tragedy attains more effectually the end of art itself, for it aims at a purpose and an end.” That is to say, it has an ethical interest in so far as it is the moral intention of the dramatist to constitute himself a teacher, and an æsthetic interest as a work of art.

In this unique collection Sophocles occupies what we may term the normal place. His works are the most perfect type of those productions in which the genius and ἦθος of the nation are most truly represented, and which also found most favour with the Greeks themselves. Not that we would place Æschylus or Euripides on an absolutely lower level—for in some respects of dramatic treatment they are greatly his superiors;—but his successful handling is in all cases so apparent, that for critical purposes he constitutes a better model and standard of reference when we come to apply the test of rules. He performs what he undertakes to do so perfectly that he lays himself little open to adverse criticism or serious objection; and there is, besides, such a wonderful consistency and fitness visible in his dramas that in respect of symmetry and artistic execution he is altogether without a rival. In his process Sophocles is a

deliberate workman and a thorough master of his craft. He was one of the first to divine the supreme importance of art in literary composition, and to show how beauty of form and care of style can add to the value and durability of the work. His draughts of character are never lightly sketched, but finished and complete. Though his plan is exceedingly simple and well compacted, he never neglects any resource of detail, and invariably succeeds in keeping our attention on the stretch to the close. In the exhibition of manly pathos he reaches a height of sublimity unmatched by any writer either in his own or in any other age, presenting us with portraitures of character where human nature assumes its highest dignity under the heroic exhibition of a fortitude in suffering which is almost superhuman.\* Different in natural temperament from his two compeers, he possesses the most complete command over his own feelings, however his design may be to rouse pity or indignation. His plots are always gradually developed, and he takes care to subordinate the minor accessories to the general harmony and unity of the whole. Further, he possesses a complete command over every variety of metre, which he adapts to his subjects and to the occasion, changing it at will by abrupt or almost imperceptible gradations. Add to this his strictly dramatic language, which bears a stamp peculiar to itself, and retains a distinctive mark upon his page. In truth, Sophocles seems to have created a dramatic language for himself, just as Demosthenes did his oratorical language to suit his purpose; and the result is in both cases a marked and potent individuality, increased emphasis, and a more lasting impress left on the mind of the reader. The language of Sophocles is what we might call remarkably muscular; as if, taking a hint from the athletes of his day, he determined to bring to his task all the powers of his mind in the highest condition. On the other hand, the language of Euripides—as clear, fluent and flexible as that of Plato himself—suffers from expansion, and the dramatic effect is necessarily deteriorated thereby; while his moral sentence, though generally sound and appropriate, too often takes a prosaic form. Even the masterly colloquial ease he exhibits is at times so destructive of all illusion, that we might often fancy ourselves conversing with some Athenian contemporary when we have a heroic or mythical subject before us. *Æschylus* certainly never sins on this score. His obscurity springs from his daring and irrepressible fervour, and the force of his imagination. The same wild and desultory irregularity which is visible in the Pindaric ode pervades his choruses, and is carried even to greater

---

\* As in that of *Hercules* in the "*Trachiniae*."

extremes. Out of the intense fervour of Æschylus' nature his style, it is true, becomes occasionally obscure and enigmatical; but when we have once admitted his tendency and recognized the *indoles animi* of the poet, we see that there is no factitious intent, and we have no desire to exchange it. Æschylus not only absolves himself from all rules, but seems carried away in spite of himself. Nothing can be more opposite to this than the manner of Sophocles. His distinguishing characteristic is his admirable reserve. He is as calm and unmoved as a statue amidst the throes and agonies he exhibits. Cool and unimpassioned himself, and a complete master of his feelings, he is yet gifted with the power of creating the most violent tension in the breasts of his hearers. His composure, indeed, has almost been made a ground of censure. He is also much given to take abrupt turns as if to divert the course of the plot, and when he fancies he has his audience completely under his control, he seems to deliberate with himself as to what change he shall next give to the theme he has in hand.\* Perhaps it is this supreme self-possession which has led an acute German critic† to say, that when Sophocles approaches the catastrophe "he retards his steps." This, however, is never done from a sense of hesitation or difficulty, but rather, it would appear, from a feeling of triumph. In thus keeping a reserve of power, and never expending all his force, Sophocles is here only in accord with the great masters of art in every department. On the other hand, when we come to criticize Euripides on this ground, we see at once the difference of the temperament of the two men. The convulsions of the latter, emphasized to excess, seem to be due to a strong personal effort. Classed among the weeping philosophers,‡ his flood of pathos is sometimes so exaggerated as even to be fatiguing. He obtrudes his own sense of pity on his audience as if he desired to take credit for all he professes. Hence his tender and touching scenes, though given much more in detail than is the habit with the other two, do not always stir us. We are unable to rise to the height of the grief he would excite, and think the picture a little overcharged. In this respect he strongly resembles Jean Jacques Rousseau; and we fancy we detect in both cases something resembling a trace of insincerity. Sophocles, on the other hand, by still denying

---

\* As where Polynices appears in the "Œdipus Coloneus" (v. 1179); and in the "Philoctetes" (v. 1179), where Neoptolemus repents of his deceit and altercation with Ulysses. In both cases we are led to expect a divergence which does not occur, and the issue, though in conformity with the previous part of the plot, comes upon us by surprise.

† F. Jacobs, "Hellas."

‡ Thomas Magister speaks of him as—*στρυφνὸς τοῦ ἥθους καὶ μισογέλως*.

us what we think to be our due, increases our impatience. In short, as a consummate artist, he is content to stir our imagination and leave us to complete the picture for ourselves. Hence no writer so well understands the supreme art of leaving certain things unsaid. This we consider to be one of the essentials to good dramatic handling, whether on the ancient or the modern stage. If an author leaves nothing to the imagination of his audience to fill up, the illusion vanishes. The talent of a dramatist obviously consists, not in the power of giving way to his own feelings, but in his power to control the feelings of the spectator. Unlike the lyric poet, whose egotism is often the legitimate motive of his theme, he must suppress his personality, and first be master of himself before he can constitute himself master of others. This perpetual confession of a want of manly fortitude on the part of Euripides, tends to shake our own resolution, and we find but a poor consolation in the abundance of moral reflection which he pours out in our behalf. Hence he succeeds much better in what has been called "serio-comedy," where deep pathos or violent emotion does come into play—as in "Ion," or the "Bacchæ," or "Iphigenia in Tauris." In the romantic treatment of a story, however, Euripides surpasses his compeers, and in depicting the softer affections and quiet scenes of domestic life is without a rival.\* Aristotle, it is true, referring to the "Medea," styles him the most tragic of poets, but we think this remark refers to his choice of subject as regards that drama, rather than to his manner of handling it.

In passing from Homer and the Epic Cycle to the tragic drama, the student finds himself almost in a new world, though the names and local associations are in many instances the same. He cannot fail, however, to be struck with the marked change which has taken place in the ethical atmosphere, so to speak, of the new creation. The moral view of the duties and obligations of life is in many respects entirely different. What is perhaps most remarkable in the new social conditions is, that man appears to be subjected to an unseen but overpowering force, which is superior even to the rule and intervention of a benevolent Providence. In the interval, the underground deities—*θεοὶ νέκτεροι*—have usurped many of the functions of the Olympians. The sway of the latter has become feebler as well as less indulgent to mankind, and a much harder fate seems to impend over the pilgrimage of man's life on earth. Nay, even the gods show themselves jealous of man, and war

\* It is the glory of the French stage to have produced a drama founded on one of Euripides, which may be said to surpass the original. We allude, of course, to the "Phèdre" of Racine.

against his happiness. Curses—*ἀραὶ*—have become almost as frequent as prayers,\* and the troubled spirit seeks consolation in the acknowledgment of an inexorable avenging influence, sometimes appealed to as Nemesis. A certain homicidal fierceness also tinges the character of many of the popular myths, and a sense of doom—which even the gods have not the power to relax—seems to permeate the general conviction as part of an accepted creed. We see, in short, that “the poetry of joy”† has passed away and given place to something sterner. That bright ideal can only be contemplated dimly in the distance, or longed for by those who would realize the dream of Plato’s anterior world. There is clearly nothing of this overwhelming pressure in the Homeric epos. There the poetry of joy flourishes in a rich soil, and the destiny of man, on the whole, is rather to be happy than to suffer. Fate, it is true, is represented in Homer under the harsh epithets of *κραταὴ*, *ὀλοή*, *χαλεπή*, *δυσώνυμος*; but Fate is not in the “*Iliad*” or “*Odyssey*” a persistent *ἀλάστωρ* thirsting for retribution. Further, in the interval the conviction of human responsibility has largely developed; but not in the elevating and compensating sense; for the closing scene of life is always associated with the remembrance of a dreary companionship with the infernal deities in the sad and sunless courts of Pluto, whence the dissatisfied spirit vainly longs to return to the upper air. All this is accepted as a stern necessity against which it is vain to protest. In the Homeric poems the gods and goddesses—though paragons of caprice—possess special benevolent powers and freely indulge their likings. When appealed to by prayer—which is of very frequent occurrence—they generally yield to the request, and man, profiting by their consideration and sympathy, finds his lot mitigated by the contact, and accepts his destiny with complacency. But in the tragic drama, which is four hundred years posterior to the epic, the stern decree has gone forth, the fiat of destiny must be executed, although involving the destruction of rank and family, and the offspring to the third and fourth generation. The “condition precedent,” in short, must be performed to satisfy the demon of *ἀλάστωρ* which cries perpetually for justice, and sometimes even challenges the jurisdiction of tribunals placed under the protection of deity. In the interval also, some of the brightest

\* Thus Orestes says: “If vengeful prayers can pierce into the earth”—*ἔπερ γὰρ εἰσὼ γῆς ἀκοντίζουσ’ ἀραὶ*.—“Orestes,” 1241.

† Schlegel says that “the Greeks invented the poetry of joy;” he should rather have said the Ionian Greeks, of whom Homer and Anacreon are the chief exemplars.

of the divinities of the popular myths have lost much of their dignity: Apollo, so majestic in the opening of the "Iliad," has fallen under misfortune. He has been banished from Olympus, and wanders for a time as a slave and an outcast.

It is an error to suppose that this submission to fate is peculiar to the drama, and that it is the special province of the epic to deal with more cheerful themes. On the contrary, this belief in fate was a characteristic of the Hellenic race down even to a late period. Even Demosthenes appeals to it, and makes use of it as an argument to defend his conduct and excuse his failure;\* and it is obvious that it had great influence over the minds of the people. In the dramas this acknowledgment of a potent Nemesis—which, it may be observed, is coincident with the growth of formal religious observances, Orgiastic rites, purifications, and the constant appeal to the shrine and the oracle—pervades even the minor concerns of life, and consequently all moral claims founded in human sympathy and natural justice are subordinated to its influence. In Sophocles it is particularly prominent; and although in Æschylus we recognize it in a mitigated and qualified form, in his case, however deep the gloom, there is always shining overhead a certain brightness and hope amid the moral wreck of things around. Still it is obvious that the fatalistic creed is not willingly accepted by Æschylus, though he does not actually protest against it. The effort he makes, for instance, to give a legal and not a supernatural justification to the matricide of Orestes, shows that he is not altogether swayed by the fatalistic influence. Before Orestes kills his mother he hesitates, and is even inclined to ignore the oracle, until Pylades reminds him of the terrible consequences of his disobedience to the injunction of Loxias:—

Deem all mankind thy foes, save the just gods.†

In the "Eumenides" also the vengeful sisters carry their point so far against Minerva and Apollo as to insist, before they will waive their anger, on being propitiated by the assurance of their future reign in Athens. But in Sophocles there is rarely any mitigation of the decrees of fate. In the "Œdipus" we see the man who has saved the State from the ravages of the "harsh-screaming monster," and who is the very type of a conscientious sovereign, struck down from his high elevation by reason of the irrevocable decree which has gone forth against

\* See the speech "De Corona," where he quotes the epitaph over the slain at Chæroneia:—*ἐν βιοτῇ κοῖραν δ' οὐ τι φυγεῖν ἔπορευ.*

† *Ἀπαντας ἐχθρούς τῶν θεῶν ἡγοῦ πλέον.*—"Choëph." 899.



him and his posterity. On the other hand, Euripides, though dealing with the same themes, obviously endeavours to shake the whole Hellenic scheme of fate, both as regards its special incidence on particular men and the authoritative source from which it springs. He would substitute for it the accidents of fortune and the general laws which govern humanity; though he confesses on all occasions that man is born to sorrow and disappointment as an inevitable ingredient of his nature. This is obviously a return to the old mild Ionian creed; towards which, it will be observed, all the writers of that race either more or less incline. If, then, Euripides in dealing with the popular myths is necessarily obliged to conform to the sterner Dorian traditions, he softens the picture by the free introduction of consolatory moral reflection. He does not pretend to re-instate "the poetry of joy," or to make happiness the end and aim of man's being. With him the "*Juventus Mundi*" is virtually past and gone beyond recall: man is too far removed from the gods to hope to realize that condition. But then he invests his deities with more mild and beneficent qualities than either of his competitors, and makes humanity join hands with the Olympians; and, we may also add, was severely taken to task in his own day for doing so. Sophocles, on the other hand, is intensely Dorian. He stands up rigidly for authority, rather than the merciful relaxation of the law. He insists on fate taking its course, and seems even to delight in enforcing the higher decrees. Whence then comes the discrepancy in the ethical manner of treatment, and the moral departure between the epic and the drama? We reply: From the sway of Ionian influences in the one case and Dorian in the other. An interval of at least four or five hundred years has elapsed, and mighty events have been crowded into that interval. There was good reason why harsher principles of action, and a sterner and more necessitarian creed should emanate from the Dorians. The Dorians came in by conquest, and held by the right of the spear. They likewise brought with them Dorian traditions, Dorian prejudices, and Dorian beliefs, which had little place in the Homeric era. The return of the Heraclidæ, in short, was for every part of Greece, not merely a revolution, but a severe subjection. Though Athens shook off the incubus as far as government was concerned, it could not quite shake off the Dorian sentiment. Can we, then, be surprised that "the poetry of joy" only found breathing space in the colonial settlements of the Ionic-Pelagic race in Asia Minor and the islands? Here the Ionians escaped the iron pressure of military sway, and preserved their traditions and theogony unimpaired; and Athens, of kindred origin with the Ionians, and which always kept up a

correspondence with the members of the race, was the first to profit by its reflux in after-time, when the Persian irruption drove the scattered remnants back upon its chief centre. It is unquestionable that the colonies in Asia Minor and the islands were greatly in advance of Greece proper as regards culture and the refinements of social life. It is idle to say that they derived this from their contact with the Asiatics. To affirm such a proposition is to elevate barbarism and effeminacy above free thought and the traditional influences of race. Its original source lay in Greece proper and the islands, which in the far fore-time had been the nursing mother of the Ionian ἥθος. We are sorry to have here to differ from Mr. Grote, who notes the discrepancy between these two periods, and who attributes the religious change chiefly to Asiatic and Phœnician influences. Nothing, assuredly, can be more opposite to the slavish and abject adoration of the Eastern nations than the fiery individuality which the Dorians threw into their forms of worship. Eastern worship is self-abnegation, not self-assertion; and as to the belief in fate and destiny, with the Greeks they are *active*, not *passive*, manifestations. Whether the transforming influence of which we speak came from Phrygia or Thrace, it was essentially of a Dorian and not of an Asiatic character:—least of all, can it be said to have any traces of a Semitic origin.

But still the Dorian element in Greece was very tenacious, and showed its spirit to the last, in literature as well as in individual character. It was of great importance in moulding the institutions and in creating government by compromise, which is the origin of modern freedom. It imparted the energy and momentum which carried Alexander to the banks of the Indus and the shores of Africa; but it lacked the wide inclusive spirit of humanity. Its creed was essentially narrow—a blessing for the Hellenes rather than for mankind. Its social principles were harsh, and founded in antagonism. It divided all Greece into two great camps—the oligarchical and the free—though it fostered a healthy rivalry and competition, out of which sprang the conflicts and legal adjustments of civic life. The Ionian element, on the other hand, rebelled instinctively against discipline and the rule of the spear, and in the end regained the mastery, virtually reinstating the milder influences which had prevailed in the pristine Homeric era. We think also that the Dorian traditions had always a much stronger hold of the mass of the Hellenic people through what might be called the superstitious susceptibilities, while the Ionian appealed rather to reason and the enlightenment of the conscience. Euripides, the pupil of Anaxagoras, was the first to assert its right to a voice on the stage, and mainly through his influence and the speculations of

the philosophers,\* the milder Ionian ἡθος, expressed in the love of pleasure and the love of contemplation, as well as the inculcation of a wider humanity, was disseminated into every region where Greek customs found a home or the Greek language was spoken. On the other hand, the bias of Sophocles in favour of the ascendant order, its traditions and its creed, is everywhere apparent; nay, his very art is of a severe and orderly nature, and is as firmly compacted as the Greek phalanx. When his heroic characters give way to pathos, it is the expression of the violent grief of a powerful man who, in his day of success, has made lesser men feel the rigours of his sway. We see that Sophocles has no grand humanity in view; that the scope of his affections is national, and practically bounded by an admiration of his own countrymen. If we say that he best expresses the sentiment of Greek life, we do not state the exact truth, for he more properly represents only the ascendant Dorian element. For free institutions he has no particular enthusiasm, though he respects the forms. If we wish to compare the political tendencies of Sophocles and Euripides respectively on this ground, we may read the confession in Creon's speech in the "Antigone" of the former, and the exposition of the theory of free government by Theseus in the "Suppliants" of the latter. Sophocles almost sneers at free institutions when he says: "He instructed himself in the angry passions of civic life" (ἀστυνόμους ὀργὰς ἐδιδάξατο); while Euripides, on the other hand, calls kingly government "an iniquitous felicity" (ἀδίκταν εὐδαίμονα).

We do not consider the above digression as here quite out of place, for a proper discrimination of the differences of race to which we have referred is the very key to a right understanding of the purport of the Sophoclean drama. Let us not forget, therefore, that, while modern critics claim for Sophocles the transcendent place in respect of art, it is mainly through the Hellenic types he presents to us that he is entitled to that pre-eminence. We can only judge of him by comparing him with his two compeers, and unfortunately we are compelled to rely on mere fragments for this purpose. We believe if we had, not merely the seven extant dramas, but the ninety or more which he is said to have composed, our wonder and admiration would indeed be great. The fragments of his lost plays are so abundant, and their titles so various, that we are warranted in affirming that Sophocles possessed a versatility which is by no means fully

---

\* Anaxagoras protested against the doctrine of predestination and fate, and consequently against the superstitions on which it was founded. Diogenes Laertius very justly classes all the leading philosophers of Athens as belonging to the Ionian school of thought.

indicated by the seven rescued dramas which have come down to us. We must, therefore, be cautious in concluding that, because a certain sameness is visible in those dramas we possess, Sophocles lacked the inventive faculty or the power of varying his theme to suit the occasion. Many of these fragments display the high meditative and sententious power for which we give Euripides so much credit, and if we could institute a complete comparison on this ground, it is possible we might discover that Sophocles is quite as rich and abundant, and perhaps much less inclined to harp on the one melancholy string.

In instituting a comparison of the respective merits of the three rival dramatists, it is important to note that during the last hundred years or so a marked revolution has taken place in the matter of taste and opinion. But such revolutions need not alarm us, for we find them paralleled in our experiences of imitative art. For instance, neither the Apollo Belvedere nor the Laocoön are considered in these days to be the most perfect gems of ancient sculpture, as they were sixty or seventy years ago. Many good judges now-a-days would give the preference to the Venus of Milo, the Niobe Group, or the Torso of the Otricoli Zeus—or perhaps even to those weird-like figures in fluttering robes which Professor Fellowes rescued from the ruins of Xanthus. In like manner opinion regarding the respective claims of the three Greek dramatists has undergone a remarkable change even since Porson's day, who, to our ill-luck, lived before the æsthetic test was instituted. We should like much to know what Bentley or Porson would have thought of the æsthetic test.\* Certain it is, however, that if a hundred years ago the suffrage of the great scholars of Europe had been taken, Sophocles would not have held the high distinctive place of pre-eminence he now does. Until near the close of last century, when Lessing broke up new ground and led the way, the majority of readers regarded the works of Euripides as the most interesting of the three, and certainly as written with a more elevated and intelligent moral purpose. Euripides also appears to have been the especial favourite of Cicero, and held the ascendant among scholars throughout the Middle Ages. For Sophocles, until Lessing's day, there was certainly no particular enthusiasm, and his works were much less frequently referred to. As for Æschylus—the greatest of the three in respect of genius and sublimity—his claims were only imperfectly appreciated. It was almost taken for granted that his genius was so wild and erratic as hardly to be fathomed; and the corruptions of the text greatly helped to encourage this im-

---

\* Porson, we must remember, always upheld Cibber's version of "Richard the Third," as an acting play, in preference to Shakespeare's.

pression. Of course, there were always a few great names who got glimpses of the light, and upheld him as the sublime and unapproachable father of the art. Pierre Brumoy, however, the enthusiastic French critic, who so often gave way to rapture when he spoke of the Greek drama, went so far in the contrary direction as to pass a severe censure on one of the finest productions of Æschylus—the “Eumenides”—declaring his wonder that so polite a nation as the Athenians could have tolerated the exhibition of such extravagance. The flights of Æschylus were, indeed, pronounced to be wondrous—“something rich and strange”—but still decidedly out of the normal track. In fine, Euripides was generally considered by the majority of critics—learned and unlearned—as the one who had best succeeded in rousing our finer sympathies and emotions, and who was alone, in this respect, comparable to Shakespeare. Sophocles was regarded as an exemplary and finished Greek writer, but still somewhat severe, as well as cold and unexpansive in his manifestations. Despite all his faults, the J s uit Pierre Brumoy has laid the literary world under great obligations; for it was he who stirred up the public enthusiasm for the Greek drama to the height of intensity and spread far and wide the faith in its excellence. From his energy and devotedness he might aptly be termed the Peter the Hermit of dramatic critics. The Euripidean fever was at its height when he held sway, but after his death a violent reaction set in; though Porson still clung to the old traditions, and seems to have devoted the bulk of his criticism to the plays of Euripides, while he bestowed occasional prelections on the other two. It was not, however, until the days of A. W. Schlegel that Euripides was boldly taken to task and fiercely denounced by a modern critic; and almost ever since it has been the fashion with scholars to decry his merits, and indicate his dramatic shortcomings—and most of all—his supposed dangerous moral purpose. It required not only a more profound and critical study of the Greek language, but a more correct knowledge of the principles of art to bring Sophocles to the front; and this once accomplished, he may now be said to hold the leading place in the estimation of critical scholars. What Lessing did in the way of art, Brunck completed by his critical erudition; and by presenting a text and an exposition, which were considered in their day the perfection of good taste and discrimination, laid open beauties till then undisclosed. But it is only in comparatively late years that the admiration for Sophocles has risen to absolute enthusiasm. Critics have even gone so far as to pronounce him perfect—a measure of praise none of them are willing to accord to Æschylus or Euripides; for the one shows himself almost defiantly independent of the rules of art, and the other has acted in apparent

ignorance of them. We think this opinion roughly expresses the view of most scholars in the present day. In our humble opinion we cannot help regarding it as somewhat sweeping and high-handed, and in the course of this article we may possibly be able to show that the æstheticians must not insist too far, and that the preferences of the old school—whom, by the way of contrast, we might call “the emotionalists”—had a good deal to justify their instinctive preferences.

We have hinted at Sophocles being wanting in the expression of that wide and indulgent humanity which we have ventured to call “Ionian.” \* As we have said, his view is strictly bounded by the limits of his own nationality; though, on that account, he is beyond doubt more perfectly Hellenic. Even Æschylus, who fought against Xerxes, has a sympathetic word for the Persians and their mighty king, whose disturbed shade returns to earth to reproach his kindred with their degeneracy. And here we may observe we fail to recognize in Sophocles the ideal divinity, regarded in its theological sense, which Professor Plumptre claims for him. We cannot discern in his writings “the working out of a reconciliation of the divine justice with the miseries and perplexities of life that seem to contradict it.” The only consolation he gives us is, that things are so fated and fore-ordained, and that we must submit. Nay, Professor Plumptre goes even so far as to indicate that many of his thoughts “approximate to the mystery of the Atonement,” and that they may be said to have anticipated some of the doctrines of the Fathers of the Church. To this, we fear, the æstheticians will say: “So much the worse for Sophocles and the Greek drama.” We certainly think it is somewhat straining the meaning of the passage in the “*Œdipus Colonus*”—*μυρίων μίαν ψυχὴν τὰδ' ἐκτίνουσαν*—to interpret it as the sacrifice of one soul for many to appease the wrath of offended deity. Sophoclès is far more cautious and measured in his teaching. On the other hand, the moral purpose of Euripides—while he always upholds the principles of social life and free government of which Athens was the type—is of the widest and most benevolent scope. He aims at the conception of a sway which lies far beyond the limits of the nationality. In truth, his sentiments seem to form a connecting link between the aspirations and sympathies of his times and our own. His doctrines sound in our ears almost like a revelation. His calm contempt of superstition amidst the general credulity of his age seems as the voice of a higher philosophy which claims the right

---

\* Herodotus, an Ionian, obviously looked on Greece proper with an Ionian eye; and when he speaks of the Hellenes almost identifies them with the Dorians.

of controlling everything within the domain of reason. But his spirit of negation sometimes carries him beyond the bounds, and he leaves us, as it were, no ground to stand on. Thus, in the "Suppliants," he tells us that the soul of man returns whence it was taken, the body to its earth, and that we really possess nothing here but to "inhabit life"—*ἐνοικῆσαι βίον*. And likewise in that finely worded passage in the "Alcestis" we find the same tendency of thought when he makes Hercules say—certainly in a rather epicurean mood :—

Since we are mortal here, let us reflect

As best becomes the grave and wise, whose brows are wrinkled :

To all of these—if I may be the judge—

Life is not truly life, but chance and accident.\*

Now, although such speculation may be dangerous ground to venture on, to our idea a dramatist who lacks this wide recognition of a common humanity, however correctly and artistically he may treat his subject, is unquestionably inferior by comparison in his sympathetic range. Why do we accord such a supreme place to Shakespeare except for the possession of this very gift? We are not for denying that Sophocles possesses this power, for he makes abundant use of sententious reflection, and that without ostentation or parade; but he certainly regards human life from the strictly Hellenic point of view, while Euripides forgets that he is a Greek to remember that he is a man. If a writer can attain to it, surely so wide and overflowing a sympathy is a high merit and not inappropriate to the drama? Where Euripides fails, it is not so much in respect of sentiment or characterization, as in the constructive part of dramatic art. In short, he is a very unequal and negligent dramatist, often giving us a high promise at the outset which he does not fulfil, and too often forgetful of the business he has in hand. This is never the case with Sophocles. No one was ever more observant of the Aristotelian canon which enjoins, not only a perfect connection of all the parts, but a complete consideration of the whole subject before setting to work. He seems also to have devoted himself more thoroughly and exclusively to his profession than either of his rivals. The story told by Athenæus as to his having taken Æschylus to task, has an air of reality about it, and we may well fancy such a criticism to have come from Sophocles. Æschylus was supposed, from his intense fervour,

\* "Ὅντας δὲ θνητοὺς θνητὰ καὶ φρονεῖν, χρεῶν,

"Ὡς τοῖς γε σεμνοῖς καὶ συνοφρυνόμενοις"

"Ἀπασὶν ἔστιν—ὥς γ' ἐμοὶ χρῆσθαι κριτῇ—

'Οὐ βίος ἀληθῶς ὁ βίος, ἀλλὰ συμφορά.—"Alcestis," 799.

to have written his dramas under the influence of wine,\* and Sophocles, it is said, one day twitted him by saying, that whenever he composed properly he did so without knowing it: *καὶ τὰ δέοντα ποιῆς, ἀλλ' οὐκ εἰδώς γε ποιῆς*. We are sorry to be without the retort of Æschylus, for we think he might well have said to Sophocles: "And it seems to me that you always show yourself a little too conscious of having done the correct thing." However violent may be the emotions he has to deal with, Sophocles certainly never loses his balance, and is as remarkable for sobriety of treatment as he is for deliberate workmanship: and, moreover, he takes particular care never to show his hand. As regards his resources for characterization, his personal experiences must have been exceptionally wide, for he lived during the most memorable and stirring period in the history of Greece, witnessed the battle of Salamis when fifteen years old, and almost lived long enough to see the last Dorian manifestation of high-handedness in the imposition of the Thirty Tyrants on Athens. In the long struggle with Sparta for ascendancy in Greece, he took part for a time in public affairs, and no doubt often came into close contact with the leading men of both parties. Pericles, however, seems to have had no very high opinion of his abilities for war, and remarked that he understood "the making of poetry, but not the commanding of an army." His tastes obviously led him to devote himself early to the drama, for he was selected when quite a youth to be *exarchus*, or leader of the chorus, on account of his musical education. It was not, however, until he was twenty-five years old that he came forward in 468 B.C. as a competitor with his "Triptolemus" and defeated Æschylus in a dramatic contest. This seems to have been effected through the favour of Cimon, who, on returning victorious from an engagement, was invited to be judge on the occasion. Where party spirit ran so high in all other things, we should have been sorry to have accepted Cimon's fiat as decisive of his superiority over Æschylus.† It was not, however, until twenty-eight years subsequently, that Sophocles presented a drama for the opinion of the public, which has fortunately been preserved—the "Antigone." As many as ninety tragedies and twenty-three satirical pieces were produced by him between 468 B.C. and 406 B.C., the year in which he died. That is to say, his dramatic career extended over the extraordinary space of sixty-two years. During this

\* "There can be no dithyramb," says Epicharmus, "if you drink water"—*οὐκ ἔστι διθύραμβος, ὅκχ' ὕδωρ πίνῃς*.

† Unfortunately the "Triptolemus" has not come down to us, and we are ignorant of the name of the drama with which Æschylus competed on this occasion.



period he gained the first prize twenty times, sometimes being defeated by rivals whose works have perished and are only known by their titles.

We may here ask :—What, then, did Sophocles do for the Greek drama on making his appearance as the rival of Æschylus? In point of fact he may be said to have created a revolution in the method, though we cannot say—as we shall hereafter endeavour to show—that his innovations were always an improvement. The most important technical change he made was in the introduction, or rather in the more free employment,\* of the *tritagonist*, or third actor, whether male or female. The effect of this was to diminish the monotony of the colloquial parts, and likewise to develop a degree of subtlety in the dialogue unknown before his time. He loosened also the connection of the trilogy, or three-fold division of the plot, by limiting the purpose of each drama to the illustration of one leading fact, rather than to the exhibition of a series of mythical actions as Æschylus had done. Still, we are prepared to maintain that there is nothing in the whole Greek dramatic repertoire at all comparable to the grand trilogy of Æschylus, embracing the “Agamemnon,” the “Choëphoræ,” and the “Eumenides.” But this important change enabled Sophocles to devote himself especially to characterization; and accordingly, like Shakespeare and Molière, it is by characterization that he mainly produces his effects. This is the legitimate method of handling dramatic subjects, and is in accordance with one of the rules laid down by Aristotle—namely, that the composer must put himself in the place of the actor if he would succeed in giving reality to the representation. He also diminished the importance of the lyric element; but by doing so, unquestionably lowered both the fervour and grandeur of the ode, as compared with what we find in Æschylus. However just and symmetrical Sophocles may be in this department, even his greatest efforts will bear no comparison with those of his elder rival as regards the thrill of agitation which the Æschylean ode is capable of producing on the mind of a reader.† Further, it must be admitted, that however admirable may be the characterization of Sophocles, he does not rise to the same marvellous height of sublimity, nor do his pictures of the reverse of fortune always inspire us with a sense of hope or a belief in the guiding hand of a divine, benevolent power which

\* Æschylus, however, makes use of Pylades as third actor in the celebrated scene where Clytemnestra begs her life.

† One of the most powerful examples of this is the choral ode in the “Choëphoræ,” v. 581, in which the destructive and baneful influences of moral and physical causes are finely contrasted.

directs all things for the best, as is the manner of *Æschylus*. In both there is a perpetual conflict going on between the agencies of good and evil ; but in *Sophocles* might too often overpowers right, and the good man sinks in the encounter. But he surpasses *Æschylus* in other walks ; more particularly in depicting the passions, impulses, and struggles of individuals hopelessly entangled in the web of fate. He exhibits, therefore, all the essential requirements of tragedy, if the definition of *Chaucer's* monk—who doubtless was deeply read in the classics of his day—may be taken as an authority :—

I will bewail in manere of tragedy  
The harm of them that stood in high degree,  
And fellen so, that there was no remedie  
To bring them out of their adversity.

This is exactly the principle with *Sophocles* : if an individual once gets into misfortune, we may feel well assured that nothing can save him. Of course, there are exceptions, as in the case of *Philoctetes*, who is finally rescued, though after his sufferings he could only live to be the wreck of himself. As regards his power of depicting individuals, *K. O. Müller* says of him : " His characters are drawn with such intrinsic truth that every man may recognize in them some points of likeness to himself, and confess to a common humanity. There is consequently a depth and durability in his mode of handling which must make his sketches intelligible for all time : "—and we may add, much better appreciated by those who are thoroughly familiar with the *Dorian* and heroic side of the Greek character. Moreover, *Sophocles* is always grandly ideal, and his characters, though human, are exalted to the highest pitch consistent with human nature, and perhaps on some occasions give us the idea that there were once walking the earth types of humanity belonging to a far higher creation than our own. In this respect he may be said to transcend *Shakespeare*, for the latter prides himself on depicting humanity in its genuine mundane aspect. Swayed by this ideal conception, we have no hesitation in affirming that his draught of *Ajax* is far more heroically exalted than what we find in *Homer*. *Sophocles* seems to have thrown his entire self into the sketch of the *Salaminian* warrior—the most intensely pathetic of all his creations. In his serious and moral aspect, *Sophocles* is religious according to the received Greek dogma ; but he does not make it his primary aim, like *Æschylus*, " to show the influence of supreme wisdom shining in the midst of difficulty and darkness, and above the ruin of families and States, so that every Greek who witnessed the exhibition must have believed in the dispensations of Providence influencing the fortunes of his race, and felt

a thrill of joyful exultation in the contemplation."\* No; Sophocles is far more sober and measured in his mode of proceeding, and so he ended in being the greater artist. In truth, he belongs essentially to the æsthetic school, but his method was a sound one: he followed Nature, and exalted Nature, and was never misled by the artifices of language as too many of our modern æstheticians have been. His drift, indeed, is not always apparent, as he has a marked inclination for subtlety both of thought and expression; but still there is nothing factitious—nothing which resembles the trickery of art. One of his unfailing characteristics is the distinctness of his draughts. The characters of his dramas are all of unmistakable mould, and strongly contrasted—whether we contemplate *Œdipus*, *Tiresias*, *Creon*, *Ajax*, *Antigone*, or *Dejanira*; and this is a merit which we cannot accord to either of his rivals—for the fervour of *Æschylus* carries him away into the region of the dithyrambic; and *Euripides*, intent on reading a moral lesson to humanity after his fashion, overlooks the point of individuality, and often puts in the mouth of a slave, a stripling, or a woman, the same language of wisdom which he accords to the sage and experienced. Thus *Jocasta*, the mother of the *Epigoni*, is an example of one of the most accomplished reasoners on political and social science to be found in all Greek literature. We question much if even *Plato* himself or *Demosthenes* could have shown a finer power of arguing tersely and logically than this energetic woman. Her speech in the "*Phœnissæ*," v. 531, affords a perfect example of the argumentative, the didactic, and the epideictic combined. *Jocasta* here runs over the whole scale of consequences attending a love of power, showing the vanity and folly as well as the danger of the pursuit. If all this be out of place in the drama, all we can say is, that we should be exceedingly sorry to lose it; for we do not know where else we could find so much finely balanced good sense combined with the eloquent and passionate enforcement of moderation in all things. But the question remains:—Is it appropriate or even consistent? Does not art suffer in its perfectness by the frequent and lavish employment of such a resource? This, we fear, must be answered in the affirmative; in short, such indulgences must be considered as essentially in the nature of digressions.

We think *Aristotle* must have had the page of *Sophocles* before him when he sat down to pen his "*Poetics*," for his rules seem everywhere to fit the *Sophoclean drama*. With him τὸ δρᾶν is the distinctive quality of tragedy. We think this term is wider in its signification than has been generally assumed. It

---

\* K. O. Müller, *Hist. Gr. Lit.*

includes not only action, but movement. Nothing can for a moment be stationary. Even during the choral pauses there is something going on to develop the plot and bring the issue to completion. In Sophocles this movement is a gradual and almost insensible progression. Time with him seems to move steadily like the hands of a clock on the dial, and at the appointed moment the hour is struck. Again, Aristotle tells us that grandeur is the soul of tragedy, and that it must therefore have magnitude (μέγεθος ἐχούσης). Though it undertakes to mimic human life and human actions, it must also exalt them; and this is the invariable method with Sophocles—a result to which his language greatly contributes. In the early period of tragedy there was virtually no characterization, and even in Æschylus there is a certain want of distinctness in the outline. Then, as regards the stage resources of detail, no one seems to have understood them so well as Sophocles. Aristotle instances two examples of this from the “Œdipus,” one of which he calls “the reversal of expectation” (περιπέτεια); as when the messenger, intending to make Œdipus happy by his revelation, produces the very contrary effect. Another is “the discovery” (ἀναγνώρισις), or change from the unknown to the known after a fearful suspense; as when Œdipus, in despair, puts out his eyes. Further, Aristotle insists on the complication of the plot in tragedy; and it is just a question whether the complication in the “Œdipus” is not rather in excess. In our humble opinion the complication is here so marked that we require a second, or even a third, reading fully to recognize the fitness of all the parts in the development of the plot. Aristotle does not condemn the use of stage effect; but it must be legitimate, without trickery, and always in conformity with the grander impulses of humanity. Hence, making reference to Sophocles, he dwells on the essence of the “enigma,” as consisting “in putting together things apparently inconsistent and improbable, and at the same time in saying nothing but what is actually true.” As regards imparting his own personal sympathy to the audience—or rather in making the audience *en masse* share a common sympathy—Sophocles shows himself a master, and, as compared with Æschylus, effects his purpose differently. He certainly never “transports us out of ourselves so that we become, for the moment, all that we imagine;” nor does he abandon himself to that “fine madness” so characteristic of the frenzy of his elder rival. We are rather made to feel deeply and earnestly than to acknowledge a violent sense of nervous agitation, for Sophocles can never divest himself of a certain calm sobriety of nature which is always predominant. When we come to estimate the poetic *afflatus* of each, we think it will appear to be most

marked in the choral pauses, which in Sophocles are fine compositions which always harmonize with the dialogue, while in *Æschylus* the odes are not only inseparable from the dialogue, but their introduction is a positive relief, and enables us to reflect and recover from the high state of tension we have experienced from the incidents previously presented. With the lyre once in his hand, *Æschylus*, as if possessed of a conscious inspiration, seems to forget his position, and strikes a chord addressed to Heaven rather than to the narrow range of a theatre.

While great stress has been laid on the influence of the elegiac poets in giving form to the dialogue of tragedy, the importance of the gnomic school has been comparatively overlooked. The purport of the latter was essentially didactic, and to it we mainly owe the prevalence of sentence in the drama. *Archilochus* and his compeers gave the metrical form to the dialogue, but not the sentiment and spirit. The gnomic poets—if we can judge from the fragments in the “*Anthologia*”—were a very numerous tribe, and it is they who fill up the gap between the decline of the epic and the reign of the drama. The tragic poets not only borrowed very largely from them but borrowed sometimes even servilely. Some of their finest thoughts came from this source, and they often contented themselves with appropriating their saws of wisdom without even taking the trouble to invent. On this ground, however, *Euripides* is unquestionably the most original and inventive, and, indeed, might almost be called a gnomic dramatist. Just as *Archilochus* and his school contributed the metrical form of iambic verse, and the elegiac poets helped to fashion the language of lamentation or joy, the gnomic school imparted the reflective tendency which is so remarkable in the dialogue. These scraps of wisdom no doubt floated in the memory of the people, and a slight reminder by the poet was sufficient to make them familiar and to impart emphasis. Further, the gnomic poets were much given to treat of political and social questions—more especially *Theognis*;<sup>\*</sup> and the discussion of these enters largely into the Greek drama, where points of law and government are dealt with equitably, and sometimes even exhaustively discussed. The tendency of the orators also in after time to bring in quotations from the dramatists into their speeches shows the affinity subsisting between the colloquial language and sentiments of the drama and the stock phrases of the rhetorician. Aristotle, who missed nothing on this ground,

---

<sup>\*</sup> Solon, Bias, Phocylides and *Theognis* are the chief members of this school.

tells us that the trochaic-tetrameter\* preceded the use of the iambic verse in tragedy; whence we may infer that the influence of which we speak was a later influence, and perhaps the last finishing touch given to the character of the dialogue. Aristotle also observes that of all metres the iambic is the most colloquial. "Our common conversation," says he, "frequently falls into iambic verse. . Sophocles, however, instinctively shunned the danger of allowing his verse to lapse into the colloquial. The language which he puts into the mouths of his characters abounds in metaphor, and is decidedly of an involved and complicated nature. Even Porson admits that "he is too much given to harsh metaphors and contorted inversions of words in his desire to avoid the use of vulgar speech then in current use." To our idea Sophocles adopted this method as the result of his dramatic experience, and from a profound recognition of the necessities of art. One thing, however, must be admitted, that if the epithets and turns of phrase he employs are somewhat tortuous at times, they contain much more than they appear to do at first sight. As for perspicuity and fluency he obviously puts these considerations entirely aside, as something out of place in the drama. Yet, on the whole, perhaps his style may be described as belonging to the dithyrambic rather than to the colloquial, for we find nothing in the diction of the choral odes which can be said to be abnormal. Here Sophocles is not more enigmatical and involved than his two rivals. We are also inclined to think that his early addition to choral composition, resulting from his musical tastes, may possibly have influenced the character of his iambs: but if so, we cannot but regard the accident as fortunate, for we see that tragedy has gained much in dignity and impressiveness by it. Further, as regards language, all authors of mark are either more or less given to mannerism, and often reach their highest effects by special means. Thus, Sophocles is much given to make use of a double metaphor in the same simile, and likewise to a reiteration which might almost be termed tautological. The forcible effect of this resource, however, is unmistakable. It is for this reason that we think the genius of Sophocles lies mainly in his language rather than in his sentiment; while in Euripides a fine sentiment is often almost nullified by its linguistic expansion. Æschylus, on the other hand, is strong both in expression and in imagination.

---

\* Sophocles, it is true, makes use of the trochaic-tetrameter in the "*Oedipus*" to enunciate the saying of Solon; but as we have said further on (p. 373), we have reason to conclude that these lines were not spoken, but intoned to dirge-like music by the Chorus.

Further, we are all well aware how much the force of oracular enunciation lies in its obscurity. If there were no enigma to unriddle the interest would cease. Sophocles was fully conscious of this effect, and no doubt availed himself of so powerful a resource. In some instances, however, it must be admitted that he allows himself to fall into the colloquial, as in the concluding lines of Creon's speech in the "*Œdipus Tyrannus*," v. 601, where the sentiment is fine, but the language is enfeebled by expausion :—

*Χρόνος δίκαιον ἄνδρα δείκνυσιν μόνος  
Κακὸν δὲ καὶ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ γνοίης μὲν.*

This Potter has rendered in a manner which will show the condensed force of our own vernacular :

—for time alone  
Shows a just man : the base a day unveils.

Part of the apparent difficulty in Sophocles lies in his transposition of words, and a certain freedom which he takes with the inflections of nouns and verbs, and sometimes even with syntax. These new forms, however, consecrated by his use, become virtually Sophoclean canons which are soon mastered, and, however grammatically abnormal, we should not care to exchange them. On this ground he is remarkably inventive and loves to play with his vocabulary, being likewise addicted to an alliteration which is not displeasing. His use of *ἐχθρὸς* and *ἐχθραντίος* in the same line is an example of this tendency ; as is also the relation between *φίλον* and *φιλήσω* in the same passage in the "*Ajax*."\* In each of these cases we see the enforcement both of a certain antithesis as well as apposition to illustrate the point he wishes to impress. So, in reading him, we gradually construct for ourselves a "*Lexicon Sophocleum*," and even look for certain turns of expression which we know are favourite resources with him. Many of his phrases derive force from involving an apparent contradiction ; such as—*ὥς τοῦτο νῦν πεπράξεται*—"that this shall now be done forthwith," the *νῦν* lending better assurance as to what is to be done in future. But granting this involvement and complication, what is substantially the effect of such manipulation ? The actual result is, that we have remarkable impressiveness, and that we feel, as it were, his language imprinted in our thoughts. With greater familiarity all traces of irregularity vanish, and no doubt we value the acquisition the more from being put to a little more trouble than usual. As we have no actual ground for cavilling, we have little occasion

---

\* See the quotation in full in this article at p. 374.

to take his language to pieces—though that may still be done by way of curiosity. On this ground Dr. Jebb has shown a subtlety hardly inferior to Sophocles himself, when he explains that the confusion of metaphor and indistinctness of imagery evinced by the poet in the lyrical part is “as if the figurative motion was suddenly crossed in his mind by the literal.” This, we think, at least, was not premeditated as in the dialogue, where the intention is apparent and the subtlety is used for a purpose. In truth, we may say of Sophocles that he made daring tentatives in the language which others after him did not venture to follow up. His fate was like that of Dante, to have imparted a powerful initiative which died with him; for it is undeniable that soon after his age the language lost much of its condensation and terseness, and took a relaxed and rhetorical form as it became more fluent in its course. In Sophocles, perhaps, we have—not even excepting Thucydides—the greatest amount of matter in the smallest bulk that is to be found in any Greek example. This compactness, no doubt, has contributed to repel many a student, and the result is, that a full appreciation of the language of the Sophoclean drama is perhaps the last thing an enthusiast in Greek literature attains to. This license in the manipulation of language was, however, common to all the dramatists; nor can we think that Sophocles made any illegitimate use of his style, but rather employed it with the view of concealing his dramatic purpose from the audience. In the drama, more than anywhere else, it will be found that the illusive effects lie mainly in the use of language rather than in incident: hence emphasis, metaphor and subtlety of expression are demanded in order to sustain the interest of the audience, whose imagination cannot soar into the Empyrean without being winged for flight by the poet. Sophocles, therefore, always mindful that the essential grandeur of tragedy is dissipated by the use of too familiar and homely a phraseology, invariably preserves the illusion through the resources of his vocabulary. He is likewise much addicted to the employment of sea-terms, some of which are exceedingly apt and happy. We will not exactly accuse Victor Hugo of having stolen a phrase from the Sophoclean drama—though it is possible he may have committed an unconscious plagiarism—but his title of “The Toilers of the Sea” may be found in the “*Ajax*,” where the busy fishermen are described as:—*φιλοπόνων ἀλιαδῶν*—“the labour-loving sea-folk.” Terms pregnant with pith and originality are very abundant in Sophocles, and indicative of that peculiarity of speech in which he took pride. Most people fancy that Pope or Byron has the sole claim to the authorship of the phrase, “lord of himself;” but it occurs twice in the “*Ajax*,” and is



there used to indicate the character of a man of solitary ways who would not easily brook control: and under two forms—*αὐτοῦ κρατῶν* and *αὐτὸς ἄρχων*. It here just occurs to us to ask whether Sophocles did not lay himself out to be read in the closet as well as to be represented on the stage? We decidedly think he did, though representation was the primary motive; and that the preservation of so many detached fragments by subsequent writers confirms this conclusion. We are also disposed to think that Sophocles was one of the first to recognize the advantage recommended by the practice of the later writers of antiquity of revising and retouching his works. We think his studied manipulation of the language betrays this care on his part; which, however, is never so elaborate as to affect the form or mar the spontaneity of the composition. Further, the Greek language was every day expanding and taking new forms, and the dramatists may be said to have composed in the transitional period, and at the commencement of what we might call the pure literary era. It is therefore natural that the written language should exhibit more complexity as the oral mode of communication was dying out. But, as we have already hinted, the development of a higher and more complex civilization demanded a more subtle medium of expression. Hence, in passing from the epic to the drama, we necessarily observe a great difference in the structure of the language. In fact, the characteristic simplicity of the old Ionic disappears when fused into the Hellenic. It is almost unnecessary to say that the Ionic in all its forms is a far simpler language than any of the conventional dialects which succeeded it. This we consider to be due, quite as much to the character of the race itself as to adventitious causes. When we compare, however, the *ἥθος* of each, the discrepancy is even more marked. Though Homer and the dramatists may treat of the same themes, we recognize in the latter something that has been superimposed on the former. In short, the myths took a special colouring from each. True, in the dramatists the influence of Homer is always visible,\* but there is something besides. Homer was not, as the moderns have long fancied, the sole authority in matters archaic. He had potent rivals in the members of the Epic Cycle, and particularly in the Dorian traditions which came in with the conquest of Greece by the Heraclidæ. It was not only the Peloponnesus which was subjected to the rule of the spear, but every part of Greece. In Athens the last manifestation of Dorian tendencies was in the rule of the Thirty Tyrants; and we might even say that Philip worked upon the same lingering influence in Athens

---

\* Euripides betrays this familiarity with Homer much more than the other two.

to effect his purpose. The character of these Dorian traditions is of a far fiercer and sterner nature than anything we see reflected in Homer, where we still find traces of a mild Saturnian influence. Though the author of the "Iliad" and "Odyssey" was never forgotten, we may safely say that the dramatists invariably preferred the Dorian interpretation of the past; which, indeed, was only natural, as the Athenian drama was originally moulded out of the Doric dithyrambic ode.\* In the selection of subjects it will be apparent to all readers that, except in a few instances, the dramatists took their themes from current popular legends; and even when treating of matters relating to the Trojan war, did not adopt strictly the Homeric interpretation. This discrepancy has even led some critics to doubt whether Sophocles was quite familiar with Homer. We should rather say, that Homer was only *one* of the volumes in his library.\* Our idea is, that the dithyrambic odes had dealt with most of the stock themes of tragedy long before the drama was fully fashioned into dialogue and characterization. We may, therefore, say roughly, that the Dorians transmitted the legends of the race in the lyric, the Ionians in the epic, form. Two streams were, therefore, in action which diverged considerably, and became finally united in the drama. It was also only to be expected that the later stratum, superimposed on the earlier, should predominate for a time. Nay, we are even inclined to conclude that the generation which witnessed the dramas of Sophocles was by no means so familiar with the page of Homer as is generally supposed. We should rather say that the "Iliad" and the "Odyssey" were not what we might call "popular works," but really books for the *élite* and cultivated. The play of the "Rhesus" by Euripides is the only drama we possess which is literally and actually founded on a narrative in the "Iliad."\* The draught of the character of Agamemnon is also essentially different in the three dramatists. In Æschylus he is ennobled far above the range of Homer, whose picture of him in the early part of the "Iliad" no doubt suggested the tart line in Horace indicative of the madness of kings; in Sophocles he is somewhat degraded from Homer's standard; and in Euripides he is transformed into quite a different mould, though still preserving something of the Æschylean dignity. Nothing, therefore, is more important to bear in mind, when on this ground, than the character of the source from whence the dramatists drew their inspiration, and put on the stage in so perfect a form those moving and impressive pictures of the

\* Stage representation is said to have had its origin in Ionia; but as we have no relics of that development, we are quite unable to say how far it resembled the Athenian drama.

mutability of man's estate, and the vicissitudes of fortune which were exemplified in the legends of the race and in family tradition.

It is only when we proceed to institute a comparison between the plays of the different dramatists that we can arrive at any just understanding of those characteristics of Sophocles which are essentially his own. As we have already observed, as compared with Æschylus, he limits the range of the plot, thereby producing greater condensation, and enabling the audience to concentrate the mind upon one particular fact or incident. We think it must not be too readily assumed that the tragic dramatists composed trilogies in all cases, or that the audience sat out the representation of an entire trilogy. Great as was the Athenian appetite for the drama, we think this exaction would have somewhat palled upon them. No doubt originally everything was arranged in trilogies, but we cannot help fancying that convenience must have frequently led to a breach of the rule. There is nothing in the names of the lost dramas to indicate such an invariable threefold connection, and we think we are no more warranted in affirming that every dramatic piece was in the form of a trilogy, than that every trilogy had, as its pendant, a satirical drama. Sophocles, to our mind, broke through the rule, and only occasionally wrote trilogies. Indeed, he is remarkable for his choice of exceptional situations. Thus the delusion of Ajax that he has been wronged, and the wonderful lucid intervals in his madness, form the subject of a special drama. The manipulation of the main idea is necessarily more complete than if he had attempted to depict the entire history of the life of Ajax; and Sophocles may, therefore, be said here to make use of the exhaustive method of treatment; while Æschylus, making too wide a cast, is perhaps somewhat diffuse. But it was impossible that Sophocles could pursue this concentrated plan without a certain degree of injury to the scope and grandeur of the conception. Accordingly, we have nothing from his hand at all comparable to the trilogy of the "Agamemnoniad." Even in the choice of subject Æschylus has here the advantage of handling the most magnificent theme for tragedy which it is possible to conceive—where the reverse of fortune is depicted in the most appalling colours, where the passions of individuals are exhibited in their most ungovernable excesses, and where the action is so terribly prompt, sudden, and consecutive. In the "Agamemnoniad" the crimes are of the deepest dye, and yet we do not absolutely hate the characters. We even fancy that Clytemnestra inspires pity, and that we would save her if we could; while Orestes, who executes "wild justice" on his mother, is almost acquitted in the end by our tacit consent. When a dramatist can thus, as it

were, set at defiance all moral prepossessions, and yet come off triumphant, his genius must indeed be great. The very opening scene of the "Agamemnon" is invested with all the traits of the sublime, and has a singularly solemn and archaic effect—the watchman on the house-top counting the stars, and almost worn out with looking for the signal-flash which announces the fall of Troy, and in whose musings we seem to hear the far-off echo of a departed glory. Then the preparation for the chief's coming indicated by the herald; the unexpected entry of Agamemnon himself—so calm and noble in demeanour, and all-confiding in the loyalty of his wife; the dark and tortuous designs of Clytemnestra—a weak, passionate woman in the hands of her paramour; the wild shriek of Cassandra that strikes the keynote of warning when all seems auspicious; the suddenness of the murder, the stroke of the falling axe, and the cry of the victim, to be followed by the exultation of the guilty pair, who come forth to claim the homage of the citizens with their hands reeking from the foul deed—all so terribly real, and apparently so true. Nothing can surpass such a theme in intensity of interest and in the agitations it creates. Nowhere, perhaps, either in history or fiction, are such startling elements of the reverse of fortune to be found, or such a cumulation of incidents all crowding on each other to produce the result. And, as a worthy pendant to this first part of the grand trilogy, we have immediately afterwards exhibited the sorrow and remorse of Clytemnestra for a deed that has brought no satisfaction; the steady resolve of Orestes, driven on by Loxias, to avenge his father's death; the vindication of justice in the punishment of Clytemnestra, who, in spite of her prayers and protestations, is made to walk out and die, by the hand of her own son, on the body of her paramour; finally, the madness of Orestes, pursued by the Furies—which seems such a natural consequence of the matricidal act—is only remitted when he has been chased by the foul sisters from one place of sanctuary to another, and has at last put himself under the protecting ægis of Athene. Well may we ask for the choral pauses to enable us to collect our thoughts and to breathe freely. To those who, on æsthetic principles, deny the genius of Æschylus for art, we would ask:—Was it by accident or design that he delayed the entry of Agamemnon on the scene until the middle of the piece (v. 819), so that when the king appears, we, who know the secret, are prepared for the consequences that are to follow, and the audience is made to see that he is a doomed man as soon as he sets foot within his own house? If art be wanting, what construction can be more effective to bring out in full relief the unsuspecting confidence of the noble victim than the intense suspense we are made to feel until he makes his first appearance?

Sophocles certainly never reached so high a pitch of elevation, and, in point of fact, has left on record the testimony of his inferiority.\* Few authors in any age equalled Æschylus in the supreme choice of his subjects—whether we regard the “Prometheus,” the “Agamemnon,” or even the “Persians.” In all these instances an enormous stake is played for—the liberation of humanity, the fall of greatness in prosperity, the ruin of a kingdom; in all the working of the passions is intensely violent, and the struggles of humanity exhibited in their fiercest extremes of grief or exaltation, while shining overhead there is always the hope of a brighter day to come, and a spirit of compensation in the suffering which is destined to bring its fruits in the end.

In the “Œdipus” we have to deal with a repulsive subject, which, indeed, could hardly well be put on a modern stage. We are disarmed, however, by the consummate skill of the dramatist, and are almost oblivious of any sense of disgust—our whole attention being arrested by the increasing complication and gradual development of the plot up to that part which Aristotle calls the *λύσις*, or “resolution,” of the *δέσις*. Here, as in the “Agamemnon,” the opening is singularly impressive. Nothing can be more awe-inspiring than the stately procession of the elders to the foot of the throne, decked in their weeds of mourning, and imploring in solemn strains relief for the suffering city, again the prey of an incomprehensible visitation. Their confidence in the genius of Œdipus to relieve the public distress strikes us as forcibly as his sympathetic readiness to lend every assistance in his power. The pestilence has here all the features of a supernatural affliction. The locality of Thebes seems to be pervaded by a predisposition to sudden and unaccountable visitations of calamity, and the dire enigma is still in the air. Some god must surely be at work to produce such sufferings as are here described, for they resemble nothing in nature. It will be interesting to scholars to compare the description of the plague here with the circumstantial narration in Thucydides of a plague which is historical. The admirable characterization in this drama is one of its chief merits. We see here what an impulsive and passionate people the Greeks were. The quick, impatient temper of Œdipus, amounting almost to constitutional irascibility, hastens his misfortunes, though he is burning with a conscientious desire to do justice and to punish wrong. But he shows himself singularly deficient in fortitude. Tiresias, also, for an old man and a prophet, is exceedingly touchy and irritable; but we have no doubt he is a true draught of the Athenian character. Sophocles has here shown great judgment in depicting Œdipus purely as a man of genius—one whose impulsive imagination might well

---

\* The comparative tameness of the “Electra” leads us to this conclusion.

have solved the riddle of the Sphinx, but quite unfit for the arduous duties of government. Creon is a fine contrast in almost every respect. He has all the talents for rule, without the conscientious motive. Sophocles seems to have especially delighted in depicting this artful and insinuating man, whose cold and wary nature enables him to make dupes of those who have the misfortune to suffer from their generous emotions. He has ventured to exhibit him in three dramas, and to our idea he is exceedingly repulsive in them all. Dr. Thirlwall considers that this character varies with each play, and that in the "Œdipus" he is intended to represent an upright and patriotic citizen. In truth, his hypocritical speeches and fine sermonizing seem to have imposed on the bishop. It is impossible that such a disposition as Creon's could ever vary, or have been ever good. He possesses, however, an admirable *aplomb*, and seems to divine from the first an inherent weakness in the position of Œdipus, who, as a stranger is in possession of hereditary rights, and by throwing out hints regarding his own influence in the State, exasperates the passionate and sensitive king, who seems instinctively to discern the direction his ambition is taking. In truth, we see that the former is a man quite unfit to rule in troublous times, and that the accident which elevated him to the throne is no proof of his capacity for government. To this end Œdipus relies mainly on his intense conscientiousness and good intentions, and Sophocles shows that, in the business of governing, such qualities of themselves go for nothing. Creon, therefore, is a fine foil to such a character, for he is an accomplished reasoner on statecraft; though he forgets that his lectures on the art of governing are an insult to a king seated on his throne. The loss of the first part of the trilogy, which probably represented Œdipus in the glory of youth and sudden elevation, is unfortunate, as the contrast between it and his fallen state must have been very marked: and we are only allowed for a moment to see him in his greatness. We think he appears, on the whole, more interesting at Colonus, though suffering under the double affliction of mental and physical pain. Perhaps one of the finest touches of Sophocles indicative of fallen greatness and of the harsh change which affects the sentiment of the world towards those in misfortune, is the bitter comment of Œdipus on his reappearance as he wanders about Colonus:—"I ask little, and yet that which I get is even less than little."\* The nicety also shown in depicting the intense curiosity of Œdipus as to the locality in which he is, and as to what is going on around him,

\* Σμικρὸν μὲν ἐξαιτοῦντα, τοῦ σμικροῦ δ' ἔτι  
Μείον φέροντα.—V. 5.

after he has become blind, and the patient interpretation of Antigone, so desirous of satisfying this natural inclination, is one of those master-strokes which indicate the talent of Sophocles for detail in essentials—the blindness being the ever-recurring characteristic of the situation.

We have expressed an opinion that the “*Œdipus Tyrannus*” is the *second* part of a trilogy, the first of which is wanting. Our reasons for coming to this conclusion are, that no important incidents have occurred in the interval, and that there is nothing to be filled up between the “*Œdipus Tyrannus*” and the “*Œdipus Coloneus*.” The first scene of the latter is so closely connected with the last of the former, that it seems almost a continuation without a break, except the change of place. Our idea, therefore, is that the lost portion represented Œdipus in the vigour of youth, solving the enigma, and that it concluded with his marriage with Jocasta and his elevation to the throne. This would obviously form a grand subject for dramatic representation; and even here Sophocles might have made use of Tiresias by way of preparation for the second part of the trilogy, to throw out dark hints and ominous forebodings indicative of future danger. We certainly think Æschylus would not have omitted to do so, had he dealt with this theme. Further, in support of our view, we may observe that we have no mention by any ancient author of a lost part of a trilogy intervening between the two existing portions. It is possible, therefore, that the first part which is lost may have borne a title somewhat equivalent to *Οἰδίπους Αἰνίγματαλὺς*.

The “*Œdipus Tyrannus*” concludes with the celebrated saying of Solon regarding the uncertainty of happiness—a theme which is of frequent recurrence in all the dramatists. To recognize the Sophoclean interpretation of it, the reader may compare it with the same sentiment in the “*Andromache*” of Euripides, and likewise in Herodotus, who puts it in the mouth of Cræsus, who had it direct from Solon himself. In Sophocles it will be observed that the employment of a peculiar diction of his own gives it additional force, particularly by the use of the infinitive *ὀλβιζειν*, which means “creating schemes of future happiness”—to which men are much given; and *ἐπισκοποῦντας*, which implies “being ever on the watch”—which men rarely are. Solon’s sentiment, as given in Sophocles, would then read thus: “Since you are mortal, be ever on the watch until your latest day, and do not congratulate yourself on your good fortune until the term of life is past, and you have suffered no calamity.” We think, however, that *ἀλγεῖνόν* is not strong enough to indicate a crushing disaster which Sophocles no doubt intended to convey—making Œdipus the example of such.

This concluding passage of the drama, being in the trochaic-tetrameter-catalectic metre, we think might possibly have been intoned by the chorus to dirge-like music, and may have been a substitute for the *θρῆνος κοινός*, or general lamentation, which was chanted by the chorus and actors in concert. The claim of the "Œdipus Tyrannus" to be considered the masterpiece of Sophocles—which is the general opinion—does not lie so much in the force of the sentiment, or even in the language, as in the masterly construction of the plot, where every incident tending to confirm the suspicion that Œdipus was both the exposed infant and the murderer of Laius is fitted together with a nicety which is perhaps unexampled in dramatic art.

Perhaps the two plays of Sophocles the best worthy of study are the "Ajax" and the "Antigone," each, however, essentially different in its structure and sentiment. We may here remark that it is one of the characteristics of Sophocles to choose generally the most difficult subjects to handle; and hence he puts himself under a disadvantage at the outset. Ajax, though here writhing in madness, and labouring under a gloomy sense of being wronged, is still in all respects a hero even beyond the Homeric type. In him we recognize of what stuff the fighting-men of Greece were as late as the fifth century B.C. Even the wholesale slaughter of the flocks and herds, which he mistakes for men, thinking that he is wreaking vengeance on his enemies, gives us a thrilling idea of the fearful destructiveness which lay in the arm of the gigantic son of Telamon, and what a powerful adjunct Ajax must have been to the forces encamped before Troy. His sense of wounded pride and forfeited renown is only appeased by the near prospect of death, as he broods over his dishonour and the distress of his venerable father, who is sitting at home by his solitary hearth waiting for the glorious return of his son clad in the arms of Achilles. But this the old man will never see. His character furnishes us with an exalted type of a noble and confiding nature that has suffered from its unguarded frankness; and here we have a counterpart of Œdipus himself. But with the burden of misfortune Ajax has become a sage, and his speech is full of "high sentence, sounding in moral virtue." He possesses, moreover, a species of prophetic power which unfortunately comes too late for him to profit by. He will not tolerate the kindly and well-meant interference of his wife, whom he abruptly rebukes by an iambic remarkable for its pith and condensation:—

Γύναι, γυναιξὶ κόσμον ἢ σιγὴν φέρει.

Woman, thy sex's noblest ornament is silence.

His speech, though generally desultory and rambling, like that [Vol. CXXIV. No. CCXLVIII.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LXVIII. No. II. B B



of a man dreaming or thinking aloud, is singularly pregnant with truth during his lucid intervals. As if to justify himself for having observed a cautious and moderate attitude in his dealings with men, he thus enlightens the chorus on the subject of his experiences in life :—

This wisdom I have learnt—to treat my foe  
As one perchance to be my friend again ;  
And so to use my friend, as one who yet  
May know a change : for friendship is a port  
Wherein our bark not always rides secure.

This saying is from Bias, and the construction is as subtle as the sentiment itself, and affords one of the most characteristic examples of the Sophoclean diction :—

Ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐπίσταμαι γὰρ ἀρτίως ὅτι,  
Ὅ τ' ἐχθρὸς ἡμῖν ἐς τοσόνδ' ἐχθραντέος  
Ὡς καὶ φιλήσων αὖθις, ἔς τε τὸν φίλον,  
Τοσαῦθ' ὑπουργῶν ὠφελεῖν βουλήσομαι  
Ὡς αἰὲν ὃν μενοῦντα τοῖς πολλοῖσι γὰρ  
Βροτῶν ἀπιστὺς ἐστ' ἐταιρίας λιμήν.—V. 658.

The concluding line, which contains a fine metaphor, may be compared with the crudeness of the reason given by Bias for his conclusion—namely, “that all men are false,” τοὺς γὰρ πλείστους εἶναι κακοὺς—a justification somewhat prosaic ; and we see by this example how much Sophocles, by the mere employment of a construction of his own, improves upon a piece of proverbial wisdom which had passed current for more than a century. This subtlety of sentiment is so frequent with Sophocles, and his skill in handling it so remarkable, that we think that if he had chosen to devote himself to public affairs, his diplomatic talent would have been eminent, and perhaps Pericles would have consented on that account to have condoned his acknowledged deficiencies as a general.

The student will perhaps be of opinion that Sophocles has nowhere manifested greater power than in that part of the drama in which Ajax towards the end resigns himself to his fate and apostrophizes death, which he is so soon to meet, in language which reveals the peculiarity of the Greek belief :—

O death, my converse will be now with thee below.

Ὁ Θάνατε ! καὶ τοι σὲ μὲν κακεῖ προσαυδήσω ξυνών.

Compare this with Dante's expression for the same condition, where one of his characters in the “Purgatorio” relates the story of his assassination, and ends by saying that “he left on earth only his flesh” :—

Rimase la mia carne sola.

Ajax's love of home and country is ever in his thoughts, and as he dies on his sword, invoking vengeance on the sons of Atreus, his self-immolation has in it something resembling the devotedness of a patriot. A character so proud and inflexible, so jealous of any taint to his honour and deserts, has perhaps never been depicted in such transcendent colours. In truth, the Ajax of Sophocles belongs to the noblest period of Greece. Teucer, also, affords a beautiful example of constancy in friendship—one of the characteristic virtues of antiquity; while Tecmessa, a paragon of patience and resignation, comports herself as becomes the dutiful spouse of a strong-willed man who must be obeyed; yet who does not forget to express his pity for the dreary state of widowhood in store for her. Here, as elsewhere, Sophocles sharply distinguishes the character of the two sexes—the art and insinuation of woman as opposed to the overbearing impulse and generosity of man. Of course his types are Greek;—but some of them may perhaps be found to fit all time. Sophocles is no woman-hater, but no one shrinks less than he does from the duty of telling home truths where he thinks he may impart a good moral lesson. We may here just observe, that violent as was the temper of Greek women, the love of domination was not one of their weaknesses. Wives were content to serve and be “the guardians of the house,” as long as they could secure the affection of their husbands.

One of the most effective and appropriate parts of this drama is the chorus of Salaminian sailors, whose wild song bursts in at intervals, keeping up the memory of nationality and home; and their frequent allusions to the *couleur locale* of Salamis shows that the nostalgia was a common disease with all the members of the league who went to Troy. This frequent reference to home scenes and the vividness of the memory regarding certain favourite localities after a long absence, is one of the most beautiful traits in the Greek nationality. In his impassioned moments the individual almost deifies nature as a mother: as when Achilles in his wild grief for the loss of Patroclus, in the “Iliad,” cuts off his locks and dedicates them to Sperchius, the stream which he shall never more behold, but which still lives vividly in his memory. So, likewise, we find in the “Ajax” the same intense longing to revisit the natal soil, and the desire, as it were, to mingle the spirit with the surroundings. This, we fear, is one of those grand emotions which our modern poets have entirely lost: they can rise to the abstract love of fatherland, taken in its entirety, but they are utterly cold and insensible to the touch of local attachment.

The “Trachiniæ” is not without its interest as a drama in

depicting Hercules, not as we might expect, in his glory, but in his misfortune ; and here, as elsewhere, Sophocles makes choice of an incident difficult for an ordinary dramatist to handle. Hercules here seems more than mortal, from being made to endure more than mortal suffering, through the accident of his wife's passion for him ; who to effect her end has procured the fatal robe of Nessus as a charm. Dejanira's confession of the jealousy which is stealing over her on account of the apparition of Iole, the Eubœan slave, in the crowd, is as powerfully drawn as anything of Euripides in the same vein, and perhaps more true to nature. She can only bring herself reluctantly to confess the contrast between her fading charms and the beauty she once possessed :—

My age is in its scar, but her youth's bloom  
Creeps onward : the eye that longs to pluck that flower  
Is turned away from me.

Ὅρῳ γὰρ ἦβην τὴν μὲν ἔρπουσαν πρόσω,

τὴν δὲ φθίνουσαν· ὣν ἀρπάζειν φιλεῖ

Ὁφθαλμὸς ἄνθος, τῶν δ' ὑπεκτρέπειν πόδα.—V. 536.

The physical tortures of Hercules are here more poignant than his mental distress, though he knows that the result is fatal ; and as we read the passage which describes the wasting pest which consumes him, where he writhes under the most excruciating pain, we are strongly reminded of the incident in Shakespeare's "King John," where the king has been poisoned by a monk and he appeals in his agony to his attendants around to put him out of pain. So Hercules implores his son Hyllus, who stands by, to strike deep with the sword and end his sufferings. When he finds death approaching, he grows anxious as to funeral rites, and charges Hyllus to lay him on the pyre ; but to be manly, and not to shed a tear. He then formally offers himself to Orcus with gloomy resignation : and here we may observe that the allusion to man's future state with the Greeks, had always a reference to the infernal regions. It is of perpetual recurrence in tragedy ; but for all the characters it is a joyless change, where all active career is for ever shut out. It was, therefore, this painful suspension of activity which was to them so forbidding to contemplate at the hour of death. Hyllus, as he performs his father's behest gives way to what we should hardly expect to find in Sophocles—an almost impious condemnation of the injustice of the gods, who can thus look on and not interfere to mitigate the sufferings of man on earth. But here, as on other occasions, Sophocles insists on the sway of fate and the enduring reign of prophecy. Jove has given forth the oracle from "the paternal oak that never falsifies :"—

Πρὸς τῆς πατρῶς κ'ὐν παλιγλώσσου δρυός;—\*

and nothing can avert the doom.

The "Trachiniæ" is a drama of exceptional interest to those who wish to make a study of the language of Sophocles, which is perhaps here more remarkable and characteristic than in any of his other works. One example of this is a passage inculcating resignation, which possibly may remind the reader of some of the turns in the "In Memoriam" of the Poet Laureate:—

ὅν γάρ ἔσθ' ἢ γ' αὐριον  
Πρὶν εὔ πάθῃ τις τὴν παρούσαν ἡμέραν.—V. 924.  
Nor dawns the morrow, till the debt is paid  
Of each day's suffering.

The force here lies in εὔ πάθῃ, and the construction shows what emphasis may be given to a rather commonplace idea by an original diction. Again, we have many examples of extreme subtlety and condensation, as at v. 296:—

Μηδ', εἰ τι δράσεις, τῆς δέ γε ζώσης ἔτι.

If you *will* do so, may I not live so long as to see it.

It may be hardly fair to contrast the "Electra," which is only a part of a trilogy, with the "Agamemnoniad;" but the vast superiority of the latter in exciting our interest must be admitted by every one. We think, also, the draught of Electra by Sophocles somewhat depressing in her endless outpouring of sorrow. The fate of Ægisthus, also, is here not attended with the tragic consequences with which Æschylus has invested it; for Sophocles reserves the paramour for a fate of which we remain ignorant. His portrait of Agamemnon, also, lacks the grand proportions of the Æschylean figure; nor are we overawed by the stately and dignified demeanour of Clytemnestra, who, as a daughter of Leda, possessed that fatal gift of beauty which brought so much destruction in its train. Most of all, she inspires no pity, and we willingly resign ourselves to her fate. And yet we cannot pardon Orestes for the deed. In the hands of Æschylus, however, we are, as it were, demoralized, and acquit the son. Shall we, then, say that Sophocles is the better moral teacher of the two, because his Clytemnestra inspires fear and dislike, and that there is danger in consorting with the genius of Æschylus? This is a question which we must leave

\* We here much prefer the forcible negative κ'ὐν—which is the old reading—to that of Dindorf and Wunder, who would read: "the many-tongued oak," which must be pronounced as weak and commonplace.

to others to answer. All we can profess to do is to record our own sensations in each case.

Sophocles is much more given than either of his compeers to introduce lengthy narrative into his plays; which we need hardly say is a cardinal error in dramatic treatment, as it militates against the progress of the action. Proud of his talent for description, he is prone to indulge it to excess, and we fear it must be admitted, countenances the use of falsehood and deception. From the free employment of this resource in the drama, we see what a supreme art of lying the Greeks possessed. The device of Orestes has also the defect of not in the least assisting the progress of the plot; for although Electra weeps over what she supposes to be the ashes of her brother in the urn, she is very soon informed by himself that he has only been deceiving her; and she even forgets to reproach him with having caused her so much agitation by a needless invention. Orestes, however, excuses himself beforehand for the deception he is about to practise by a fine phrase:—

My deeds shall save me, though I die in words.

ὅταν λόγῳ θανὼν,

\*Ἔργοισι σωθῶ.

The magnificent description of the chariot-race—although a fiction—is the gem of this drama, and here we have what we might call, narrative in action. Excepting it from the piece, we boldly presume to differ from A. W. Schlegel; and instead of considering the “Electra” the finest of the dramas of Sophocles, we think that he has here shown the least power. Electra, who has been happily described as *virilis animi fœmina*, has here no redeeming quality of gentleness of character, and exhibits even a more vindictive disposition than Orestes, who, it must be remembered, is only executing a command from a higher power. In truth, as we have already said, Sophocles felt the sway of his elder rival on this ground and shrunk under the effort. He was obviously overshadowed by the memory of the grand trilogy of Æschylus which had virtually exhausted the theme and forestalled all successors.

The “Philoctetes” is a pendant to the “Ajax” as affording a picture of heroic life, and is the drama of physical suffering *par excellence*. The tortures which the Greek chief here endures from his wound produced by the bite of a serpent, almost make us shudder as we read. His cries send a thrill of pain through our nerves as he limps about, still clinging to life and the hope of rescue. But he remains always keenly alive to the sense of honour, and dreads above all things being

exposed as a spectacle of misery before the Greek Army. He has endured his pain so long that suffering is almost regarded by him in his solitude as a companion that he would hardly part with, and he has learnt even to love misfortune through necessity:—

Ἐγὼ δ' ἀνάγκη προῖμαθον στέργειν κακά.

In this drama all the associations of insular life are most graphically represented. We can almost fancy ourselves imprisoned in some wild island of the Ægean with all means of communication cut off; and in comparing the *fauna* of Sophocles with what are found to exist in this region in the present day, we see in striking colours the effects of the transformations of time and civilization. Not only has the type of man completely changed; but the solitary rugged shore, swarming with sea-birds on which Philoctetes subsists, armed with his magic bow, has given place to the traces of habitations, now in ruins, which sprang up long after his day. In examining the character of these two war-like figures—Ajax and Philoctetes—as drawn by Sophocles, we see that the high sense of honour due to personal pride and the consciousness of merit, is by no means a thing of feudal origin as is generally supposed; but that the heroes of antiquity were animated by a sensitiveness to honour quite as remarkable and as violently asserted as were the moderns, as well as by a promptness and determination to incur any risk or danger to resent insult, and to justify themselves in the opinion of their compeers.

We think it will be generally acknowledged that the great triumph of Sophocles is the “Antigone,” so beautiful in all its proportions, in which the outline of each character is so complete and perfect, and where nothing is wanting to the plot. The poet here succeeds in rousing the interest of the spectator from the first moment in the fate of Antigone, whose character, finely contrasted with that of her sister, the gentle and retiring Ismene, wins upon us as the drama progresses. She has been happily termed “the virgin martyr of antiquity,” and is, in reality, both matron and virgin, having all the serious qualities of the one, and the impulsive devotion of the other. There are, however, two Antigones in Sophocles. That in the “Œdipus Coloneus” is the embodiment of patience, meekness, and affection. She is there young and docile, and, we think, intensely sad. The dreadful calamity of her father seems to weigh upon her spirits; yet she can still give prudent counsel, and even defend him eloquently against injustice. Though she possesses the instinct of discerning wrong, she has not yet risen to the height of putting her convictions into action. In the “Anti-

gone," on the other hand, she is evidently much older, and has moved to a higher pedestal; though we can see from the first sketch of her that if the occasion should arise she is prepared to face it: but as regards this possible contingency Sophocles is judiciously silent in the earlier drama, and we are allowed to know nothing until the proper time of the energy and devotion of which she is capable. In this new phase of trial, however, she has become ardent and adventurous. Creon, the evil genius of the piece, shows himself here as elsewhere a thorough master of specious and hypocritical reasoning. He is anxious to pose before the citizens as a conscientious ruler who will vindicate justice to the uttermost, and not relax a tittle of the law. But his extreme subtlety and affectation of being a rigidly virtuous man, makes him suspected from the first moment. Antigone, acting in defiance of the proclamation, with her own hands scrapes in the earth a grave for the remains of her brother; and being disturbed in the act, is condemned to die. Creon, in short, has resolved to pursue to the uttermost the ill-starred offspring of Œdipus—the man to whom he cringed when on the throne, and whom he insulted when blind and a beggar. Like many other bad men in power, Creon is fond of bringing in the aid of superstition to assist his purpose, and he employs Teiresias, not because he believes in prophets, but because he hopes to make prophets his tool. But in his professed eagerness to vindicate justice, he overleaps himself; and unconscious that his son Hæmon is the lover of Antigone, he condemns her to be buried alive—a resolution which drives Hæmon to despair; and he seeks the cavern where she is entombed in order to die with her. Creon, who visits the cave, flies like a coward from the sword of his exasperated son, who slays himself on the body of Antigone. Creon, as we have already said, is an especial favourite with Sophocles, and one of those characters whose dark and secret thoughts he delights to analyze, and whose language finds a meet medium of expression in his own peculiar diction. In coldness of nature, joined to rare intelligence, Creon strongly reminds us of Angelo in Shakespeare's "Measure for Measure." Though he moralizes finely, he is in all respects a merciless man—perhaps we might even say, a dangerous character; and few, we think, would care to put themselves in the power of one so subtle and accomplished in the art of justifying absolute sway. No doubt there were many Creons to be seen walking about Athens in Sophocles' day, just as there were many stalwart soldiers of rank strutting in the streets of Rome, in the time of Horace, in full costume, while their backs were marked by the scars of ignominious punishment. Though Sophocles in this drama never loses the opportunity of putting

in a word in favour of strict and orderly government, and professes to uphold authority in a state as a cardinal principle, it seems to us that by the issue and its consequences he has made the "Antigone" one of the most powerful moral arguments in favour of a check on tyrannical power, and against the sway of a single individual. We should just like to know whether Demosthenes, who in his speech "*De falsa legatione*" quotes a passage from the mouth of Creon out of this drama, did so mockingly, or by way of approval of the sentiment; for assuredly he must have been well aware that Creon's speech was insincere.

The study of the Greek drama gives us an insight regarding certain traits of the interior social life of antiquity to an extent that is in no respect to be learnt elsewhere. One of the most remarkable of these—and somewhat in contrast with our own times—is the intense attachment subsisting between brother and sister of mature years. Both Antigone and Electra are examples of this; and their representation leads us to question the fond idea of the moderns, that men and women are essentially the same in all ages. We believe that no greater delusion exists, and that the testimony of Sophocles proves the contrary. In truth, when we look closely into antiquity, we see that there are certain conditions in the past, both physical and moral, which cannot be recalled. Where, for instance, could we find an exemplar of Ajax or Philoctetes in these days? In what nationality, or under what clime? Assuredly we should search in vain. But the discrepancy is, perhaps, greater as regards the other sex. Where should we now find a type like the Clytemnestra of Æschylus, who is compounded of qualities which at once mark the intensity of wickedness and fascination? And yet in the portrayal of her character we see no visible exaggeration, no overcharging of the picture by the poet. Such women as the daughter of Leda and her sister Helen no doubt existed down to the fifth century B.C. Philip's choice of Olympias would even indicate that they flourished later: and their mode of captivating strong-minded men was quite in character with their natural disposition. Olympias, the mother of Alexander, won the heart of Philip by letting him see her for the first time playing with two enormous snakes. This, we suppose, was the coquetry of fierceness and defiance. A suitor for the hand of a lady of rank in those days had to court danger, and conquer either in love or battle; and Philip, as we know, paid dearly in the end for his admiration, since Olympias almost proved a Clytemnestra, and her son Alexander was very nearly driven to play the part of Orestes. Not only has race changed, but man himself. What nation in these days can



pretend to fill the place of Greece as regards physical excellence? However we may boast of the triumph of sanitary influences, it must be admitted there is some difference between a child born in one of the airless courts of our great cities, and an infant of the twelfth century B.C. who could live to be a strong man after being suspended by the feet from a tree on Mount Cithæron.

Lord Macaulay has somewhere said that the reading of Sophocles suggests a reminiscence of sculpture. We must confess we cannot see the aptness of the criticism; for no one can say that Sophocles gives us a mere outline or that there is any want of movement. On the contrary, he is not only the most elaborate and exhaustive of the three as regards the portraiture of character, but action is his special characteristic. But Sophocles always holds a certain amount of power in reserve, and does not appear to put forth his whole strength as Æschylus or Shakespeare does. In this respect he strongly resembles Raphael, who, great as he always is, appears to have still reserved himself for something which might even surpass himself. In both we certainly recognize the entire absence of anything resembling exhausted effort, and yet both reach the topmost height of execution in their respective departments.

Besides the seven complete dramas of Sophocles, we have likewise fragments of eighty-nine enumerated plays. An examination of the titles of these will show that he was much more versatile than we might at first be led to suppose, and that he has selected subjects which run over a very extensive scale. Nearly all of these fragments are quotations in iambic verse, which would lead us to infer that the dialogue, at least, was written to be read as well as exhibited on the stage, and that the choral parts—which are hardly ever quoted by authors—were composed for the sake of harmony. This brings us to consider shortly the important part assumed by the chorus, and to verify Aristotle's opinion that the musical incidents were, perhaps, the most delightful part of dramatic exhibition. All this, of course, is now for ever lost to us, but we know enough of the machinery of the chorus at once to recognize what a powerful source of attraction it must have been. We have gone so far as to say that the choral pauses in Æschylus are at times a positive relief, and that we even look for them. What, then, must have been the effect when music and the stately or impassioned movements of the *Choreutæ* were superadded? But if we may judge by the metre, Sophocles possesses much greater variety and makes a more dexterous use of his musical knowledge than either of his rivals. In the adaptation of his verse he seems to study all the niceties of situation and even the lights

and shades of expression and sentiment. The choral odes, as we know, were intended, not only to fill up the intervals of the action, but, by commenting on what had passed, or by hinting as to what might follow, were meant to give point to the action and assist in the development of the plot. The *Coryphæus*, who spoke for his fellows, was the virtual intermediary between the audience and the dramatist himself. In the iambics of the chorus Sophocles, just as the other dramatists, generally makes use of this medium to express his own sentiments. Hence the finest sententious reflections are often reserved for the chorus, as speaking *en masse*, and representing the united opinions of the citizens or household. In a nation where the voice of public opinion counted for so much, this important place accorded to the chorus was perfectly consistent, and it flattered the vanity also of an Athenian audience to identify themselves with it. In the chorus, therefore, we may feel assured that the author would include nothing likely to be repugnant to the general conviction, which, of course, was liable to occur in the speech of a particular character, who was supposed to bear only the responsibility for his own utterances. This is an advantage which the ancient drama has over the modern, where the sentiments and reflections being put in the mouths of the characters are not the reflex of the author's convictions, but only the sentiment of the individuals represented. Hence, in a modern drama—one of Shakespeare's for instance—we can never affirm that the truth of the thought is vouched for by Shakespeare himself. As regards the choral odes, Sophocles, possessed of a fine ear for music, excelled both his rivals in the adaptation of rhythm to expression, and he seems to have had an especial fondness for what is called the glyconic metre,\* rather than the marching anapaestic to which Æschylus inclined, or the agitating dactylic which Euripides favours. We cannot, however, agree with Dr. Jebb in supposing that Sophocles carried his love of music so far as to make sound almost an echo of the sense. Such delicate touches would be, not only exceedingly difficult to effect, but the result would be hardly intelligible to an Athenian audience, who would be quite content to have such a change of pitch or movement as indicated an approximation to the change of sentiment. Nor do we think that lyric poetry was a thing of such deliberate manufacture with the Greek dramatist as not to suffer from such intricate manipulation. "In the lyric parts of tragedy," says Dr. Jebb, "the poet was a composer, setting words to music." Not altogether, we think; for the language and sentiment predominated over the vocal part so as to subordinate it. Much also must have

---

\* This metre consisted of a spondee and two dactyls.

been left to the individual independent expression of the chorus themselves. A Greek audience, of course, judged entirely by the ear and eye, and not by book, and in general had no minute perception of musical notation. No doubt they expected from the dramatist certain musical effects in certain situations. They could well appreciate, for instance, "the choriambic rhythm as the expression of vehement agitation and despair; the logodæic, where personal suffering was indicated; and the dactylic, which was slow and solemn, as the fitting utterance of lofty and earnest warning, as when oracles spoke, or of exalted faith in heaven." Dr. Jebb also observes—and, we think, justly, remembering the dithyrambic origin of the chorus—that "words, music, and dance were together the expression of the successive feelings which the progress of the drama excited in the chorus or typical spectator. Lyrical rhythms, therefore, had necessarily an ethical meaning relative to the mood in which each case sought utterance. It is everywhere characteristic of Sophocles that he has been finely sensitive to this relation, so much at least as moderns can see, however far they may be from adequately appreciating the secrets of his skill" (Introd. xcvi). To our idea the influence of music was rather emotional than ethical; and as the drama developed, the original dithyrambic element receded into the background and was deemed of less importance. In short, it was of a transitory nature in its essence, and doomed to perish.

But though we think it vain and profitless in these days to attempt to define the exact relation which existed between the choral language and the music of the orchestra, we know enough to be satisfied that the orchestral adjuncts—whether of music or evolution—were of a most imposing character, and that there was something more in these than we are now able to conceive is apparent from the confession of Aristotle himself—cold and formal man that he was. No doubt the mere entry of the chorus—a moving mass in priestly costume, proceeding with stately step, probably from the two side wings of the theatre simultaneously, to take their place around the sacrificial altar—must have been of itself singularly impressive. And when they opened with the *parados*, or entrance song, in a key appropriate to the subject of the dialogue, the audience would be in a measure prepared for what was to follow. Then, on the termination of some moving passage from a speaker, when they suddenly burst into an anapæstic or dactylic ode, or sang in concert with the actors themselves the dirge-like *θρήνος κοινός*, or general lamentation, the effect of such a drama as the "*Choëphoræ*" or the "*Antigone*" must have been somewhat electrical. Nor was the lyric part of the chorus in any wise disjoined from the plot. The lines of action converged in both departments, and were

artfully interwoven ; though Euripides has been justly blamed for neglecting this. The *stasimons*, or choral divisions, of which there were generally three or five, somewhat corresponding to our modern acts, gave breathing time to the audiences to review the incidents and estimate the skill of the composer. That part of the chorus, however, which denoted the intensely critical stage of the plot, indicative of the catastrophe—the brief, exciting strain, called the *hyporchema*, was perhaps the most effective of any ; and here, we think, the work of the author ran the chance of being overpowered by the vocal and musical element. Further, it is always to be remembered that a theatrical exhibition was with the Greeks a serious and solemn representation, and the original religious element was never disassociated from it. Hence, when Meidias gave Demosthenes a blow of his fist when the latter was performing the office of *choragus* as the part of his tribe, Demosthenes brought an action against him for sacrilege, in striking him publicly in the theatre, and made a very strong point out of it in his speech, *Περὶ τοῦ κονδύλου*, professing not to be content with ordinary damages for an outrage which was virtually against religion. Still, we must admit, notwithstanding our deprivation of the music of the chorus, there is something in a calm reading in the closet which even representation cannot give ; and that is now quite as much within our power as it was in the days of Sophocles. Some of the agitations we must be content to forego, and can only trust to our imagination to fill up the blank ; and just as Aristotle advises, that “the tragic poet should always put himself in the place of the spectator, and in composing should be for the time an actor under the influence of actual passion ;” so, when we have a work of genius before us, we may invert the injunction, and putting ourselves in the place of the poet, “be transported out of ourselves and become what we imagine.”

It may not be here out of place to recapitulate some of the characteristics of the three rival dramatists who had their partisans in ancient times as now. We may say generally, that each has his respective claims to excellence, and that no one puts out the light of the other. The ancients themselves were divided in opinion as to the merits of the three. Aristotle, in order to illustrate his canons, devotes more minute criticism to the plays of Sophocles than to the other two, though he accords high praise to the “*Medea*” of Euripides. Plutarch assigns to *Æschylus* *στόμα τὴν*, to Sophocles *λογιστήν*, and to Euripides *σοφίαν*. The first was in a measure generally considered the father of dramatic art, and regarded with a veneration hardly accorded to the other two. Diogenes Laertius, however, assigns the highest place in tragedy to Sophocles ; while Cicero, who

says that praise is to be given to all three, regards Sophocles as "doctissimum hominem, et poetam fere divinum." It was the "Medea" he was reading in his litter when the assassins struck off his head as he was making his escape to Cafeta through "the woody entanglements of the shady way" leading down to the sea-side.

We have said that Sophocles constitutes the "normal" type of the Greek drama; and perhaps some would even say, that contained within the lines he lays down is to be found the normal type of all genuine tragedy. To this, however, we can by no means assent; as it would not only disparage the merits of Æschylus—the greatest figure of any—but would detract from the claims of the moderns who have successfully broken the bounds and adopted an independent standard of their own. No; we maintain that Sophocles is not only intensely Greek, but Greek in the Dorian sense. It is this fine national characteristic which we have no doubt is the cause of his being so much appreciated by those who are fully saturated with the literature in all its departments; for they recognize in his draughts of character and in his language and sentiment, not only so much that harmonizes with the best features of Greek life, but also much that is peculiarly and only Hellenic. We question even if Homer is so pure and perfect a representative of Hellenism in all its phases as is Sophocles. This feature, though it unquestionably lowers his position, regarded as a universal teacher, makes him more perfect in the restricted artistic sense. In short, his art is faultless, because he confines his view strictly to a special development of humanity, though one of the grandest. But Euripides has greater claims upon us in another direction. Though by no means to be ranked as an apostate to the ancient creed, he emancipates himself from the narrow bounds of the nationality, and seems to presage the sentiment of the future. Hence, he was by far the greatest innovator of the three, and until late years, the most appreciated by the moderns. But he will not bear the æsthetic test. Sophocles, on the contrary, is the darling of the æstheticians, because his proportions are so exact and his measure is so sure; and he also possesses a combination of dramatic gifts, where his rivals shine only in special departments. Most of all, his language is particularly dramatic, while that of Euripides too frequently subsides into magnificent prose—lucid, flexible and harmonious. He also lacks condensation, and his thoughts pass away like beautiful sounds which are soon forgotten. The language of Sophocles, we think, never equalled the easy flow and flexibility of the following well-known lines so admirably rendered into English by the Vicar of Scarning:—

Ὁ Ζεῦ! τί δὴ χρυσοῦ μὲν ὅς-κίβδηλος ἦ  
 Τεκμήρι' ἀνθρώποισιν ὅπασας σαφῆ,  
 Ἄνδρῶν δ' ὅτ' ἀχρή τὸν κακὸν διειδέναι,  
 Οὐδεὶς χαρακτῆρ' ἐμφέφυκε σώματι.

Oh Jove! why hast thou given us certain proof  
 To know adulterate gold, but stamped no mark  
 Where it is needed most, on man's base metal?

We have often asked ourselves why it is that Euripides leaves so slight an impression on the memory—why is the effect of some of his finest thoughts so transient? We suspect that it may be partly owing to his remarkable ease and facility. He seems to have produced without strain or effort—almost, indeed, without apparent premeditation; and, it may be, composed too rapidly. All rapid composition—or what amounts to the same thing, all that is intended to be taken in rapidly, like the modern novel and the modern speech—is either more or less evanescent. Certain it is, that Euripides strikes us most forcibly on a first perusal, and then his influence slightly wanes. This is never the case with Sophocles. It is only by repeated perusal that we recognize his full force. Every time we look into his page we fancy we find more. There is an enigma here which we confess ourselves not quite able to unriddle; for it will be allowed on all hands that the first introduction to Sophocles is somewhat of a task, and that we require to put our whole energy into the work. But the effect of all writing depends on the *purpose* with which it is written. If composed for recreation—however profound the subject or however talented the author—it will not be lasting; Euripides, we fear, too often wrote to please and recreate his audience. To this Sophocles never condescends. He never swerves from the earnest, admonitory pitch with which he commences: hence, he enforces attention and commands respect. As regards the sustaining moral impression which the drama leaves on the mind, Æschylus, in closer relation with the Dionysiac festival, is infinitely, the most impressive and awe-inspiring. If he is the most religious, Sophocles is the most predestinarian; while Euripides preaches an indulgent creed, and invites man philosophically to use his observation and reason, and, in point of fact, to make himself the measure of the universe. The influence of Socrates in divining the spirit of Christianity, four hundred years before it was promulgated, has been often dwelt on; but as far as we are enabled to judge from the records in Plato and Xenophon, we must candidly confess, that we do not always recognize this spirit in his language or his sentiment. Socrates, to our mind, is somewhat captious, and essentially a wrangler, who

would bring all things to the test of reason and common sense. His aims are mundane, and not remarkably benevolent or exalted; while Plato, who professed to follow in his steps, becomes a fascinating idealist. Euripides, on the other hand, has all that wide inclusive love of humanity and that spirit of affectionate tenderness which distinguishes early Christianity. When we talk of the influence of the Greek philosophic schools in heralding the way for the institution of a milder creed, we are liable to overlook the unobtrusive influence of Euripides on this ground, who—perhaps unconsciously—has been by far the greatest pioneer, and for whom, on this basis alone, we would claim a very high place among the writers of antiquity. If Euripides neglected the art of dramatic construction, he is, however, an excellent painter of minutiae. We have nowhere in Sophocles such charming realism as in the picture of Ion in the porch of the temple chasing away the birds, and entering into colloquy with them; or Phædra struggling to conceal from her nurse the guilty passion that lies hidden in her heart; or the infant Orestes in the arms of Clytemnestra, who is here made a nursing mother looking tenderly on her son who is rocked asleep by the roll of the chariot. These delicate and gentle touches of Nature, which were considered, even in his own day, dangerous innovations and unwarrantable liberties, constituted one of the most powerful resources of Shakespeare, and have gained for him an undying name. Euripides has been singularly unfortunate both in his own day and ours. Aristophanes threw the first stone, and ever since it has been the fashion to decry his merits, or reluctantly to admit his genius.

We cannot reconcile ourselves to the modern taste for amending the text of Sophocles and venturing on new readings, which has almost become a disease. We rather incline to uphold here a little conservatism. We do not like at this date to have our established prepossessions rudely disturbed; nor can we think there is any greater ground for supposing that the text of Sophocles is faulty any more than that of the other two dramatists. To bring a codex again into court after its being thoroughly sifted by so many previous writers of eminence, seems almost a waste of ingenuity. As we have already endeavoured to show, much of the peculiarity of the diction of Sophocles is due to his individuality, as well as to a deliberate intent to construct for himself a language of his own. We must be cautious, therefore, in attempting to reconcile his text with all that is normal and even grammatical. We think, also, that much of the apparent artifice in his diction may, in part, possibly be due to his early preference for the dithyrambic ode as a model. These modern emendations of the text sometimes

curiously remind us of the process pursued by picture restorers,—except that the reign of the critic is happily only for a season, and that he cannot absolutely obliterate. To our fancy it is rather an embarrassment than an aid to be presented with half a dozen new readings of a word or passage, however ingeniously supported, which clashes with what we were perfectly content with before—perhaps even admired as rare and forcible diction. The modern schools of Dindorf and Wunder set out with the assumption that all the existing MSS. are either more or less corrupt, and hence the disposition is encouraged among later scholars to venture freely on conjectural emendation. Indeed, at times we could almost have wished that the Greek dramatists—after the manner of Shakespeare, who was so sensitive lest his bones should be disturbed—had appended an *ἀρὰ* against those admirers in after-time who should venture to tamper with their text. We think Brunck, of all editors, most nearly divined the genius of Sophocles in the choice he has made of certain readings, without any straining after hypercriticism. If conjectural emendation is once admitted, the texts, as Dr. Campbell well observes, “become fields for the exercise of guessing, and emendation is made a mere trial of ingenuity.” Dr. Jebb’s array of readings, even supposing one is not called upon to subscribe absolutely to any of them, is, we fear, calculated to shake our faith in the correctness of those passages with which we have grown familiar. So much can, with ease, be plausibly advanced on this ground by the transformation of a word, or even of a letter, that a sceptical tendency may be induced which may not be easily got rid of. We doubt, therefore, if all scholars will thank Dr. Jebb for presenting them with a catalogue of doubts in order that they may strike a balance. For our part we should rather prefer to have the labour done for us once and for ever, and to throw ourselves confidently under the ægis of some “slashing Bentley,” who spoke out dogmatically, and made us feel that we were on sure ground. Many readers, no doubt, will be curious to know how the current of modern philology sets; but the majority, we fancy, will prefer to recline upon their old convictions. We fear, also, that those who have followed in the wake of Dindorf and Wunder have been more inclined to bring Sophocles within the pale of correct writers rather than to admit his tendency to break through grammatical rules and make independent canons for himself. Amid a host of alterations for the worse, we may note two made in contravention of the opinion of Brunck—*ἐχθαρτίος* for *ἐχθραντίος* in the “*Ajax*,” and *πολυγλώσσου* for *κοῦ παλιγλώσσου* in the “*Trachiniae*,” to which we have referred. Such changes tend to weaken the force of the sentiment, and take away that stamp of individuality which we admire and even look for. It is

[Vol. CXXIV. No. CCXLVIII.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LXVIII, No. II. C C



true that, as far back as the time of the Alexandrine grammarians, the text of Sophocles was not considered free from errors. But we should remember that the Alexandrine critics were a remarkably captious order of men, and almost doubted everything while they created nothing. Porson, who was adventurous enough himself on this ground, was of opinion that "an editor must not be trusted with a discretionary power over the text;" and Professor Conington's experiences lead him "to think more highly of the MSS., and less of editorial ingenuity." In justification of the latitude which we claim for Sophocles, nothing can be more full and convincing than Professor Campbell's grammatical analysis of his language, as regards its structure and peculiarities,—his free manipulation of cases and tenses, and even his frequent disregard of authorized inflections. Still, however adventurous Sophocles may be, he never becomes confused or erratic, and invariably ends by lighting on his feet.

We fear we must also take similar exception to the imputation of "irony" in Sophocles—an idea, we believe, first broached by K. O. Müller, and afterwards followed up by Dr. Thirlwall; but, we think, in both cases, without the slightest justification. In truth, the term is fanciful and even misleading; for irony is always an unmistakable thing, and never difficult to detect. Dr. Thirlwall defines irony as "the contrast between the speaker's intention and his language." But is not this concealment of intention the practice with all skilful dramatists—nay, is it not recommended by the authority of Aristotle? We cannot understand why the employment of such a resource should be classed as irony, which is always either more or less indicative of a dissembling or mocking spirit. Further, as Dr. Campbell justly observes, "it is a great error to attempt to express the characteristics of a writer by a single word, such as ideal, eccentric, realistic, and so on. To draw forth this latent element, and to superinduce it as the prevailing characteristic of Sophocles, is to superinduce over Greek tragedy a superficial form which it does not really wear, and greatly to injure its essential simplicity and depth."\* In our opinion the singularity alluded to arises mainly from the temperament of Sophocles himself—his perfect freedom from all emotion, and his pride in wielding a power over his audience. The Athenian, like modern audiences, delighted in the suspense of tragedy, in unexpected surprises, and to contemplate from a secure station the throes and terrors of the characters from whom the real state of facts was shut out. The audience were thus flattered by the superior position in which they were

---

\* The influence of the German schools of thought has much to do, we think, with the employment of these handy, but misleading, abstract terms.

placed. But even as regards them, Sophocles seems at times to please himself with standing, as it were, behind his work and watching its effect. But his attitude here is certainly not one of irony, but rather of calm pride in his own powers. Aristotle enumerates the various stage resources of "surprise" and "discovery" which were common to all the dramatists, and which, although partaking of deception, cannot fittingly be described by a term which invariably implies a sardonic and derisive intention. Sophocles, so remarkable for measured gravity and seriousness, seems almost the last writer to merit such an imputation, and the pathos of Greek tragedy is unquestionably lowered in the mind of a reader or spectator who has reason to suppose that the author is only playing upon his feelings.

There are many things which lie beyond the region of art which may be learnt from a study of the Greek drama; and an examination of it is even suggestive of wide speculation into other regions. In truth, it is only by a study of the dramatists and orators of Athens that we can acquire any complete idea of Greek life and manners. The *ἦθος* of a nation is not to be learnt from its historians, nor even from its poets. In the drama we have the virtual dissection and analysis of the thoughts and feelings of the race; and it is only there that we find recorded their most intense manifestations of emotion. What philosophy gives us in the abstract, we here get in the concrete, and in every variety of detail. The question then naturally arises: Was the teaching of the drama—which in the end unquestionably supplanted the influence of the ancient religion in the minds of the mass of the people—a desirable and beneficial moral influence? To our mind it was, though it may be a question how far Demosthenes was justified in denouncing the passion of the Athenians of his day for the stage, who preferred to go and see the plays rather than to put on heavy armour for the defence of the country. There is no doubt also that the drama was the means of infusing a superabundance of the imaginative element into the habits of daily life, and that over-indulgence in its distractions tended to disqualify the citizen for the sterner duties of business and patriotism, and in the end helped to accelerate the national degeneracy which set in. But if it contributed to make men effeminate, and superinduced a loss of national vigour and independence, on the other hand, by its universal diffusion it humanized mankind, and taught a wider and milder morality than had subsisted in the warlike and contentious periods of Greece. There is no question that it prepared the way for the acceptance of charity and good-will among men; for the influence of the drama was ubiquitous. Wherever the Greek language was spoken, or the Hellenic race took root, the drama

had its place of representation. The smallest city of the most petty colony had its theatre, and the meanest citizen—if he were not actually franked by the State—could always afford to go and see the plays. And when to this we add, that such a magnificent repertoire existed to draw upon—probably not less than three or four hundred dramas of the highest class—we cannot wonder at the universal influence it must have exercised over minds of men in a humanizing point of view; for there is no doubt that the pictures of woe exhibited on the stage had a softening effect on those who witnessed them. This conclusion is justified by the touching line which Virgil—the most humanly sympathetic of all poets—has put in the mouth of Dido, who on receiving the wanderer from Troy, confesses the teaching of her own distresses:—

Non ignara mali, miseris succurrere disco.

There is no doubt, therefore, that the drama became a constituted moral teacher, and with its coadjutor, philosophy, ultimately supplanted the influence both of the magistrate and the priest. If men are only born to wear heavy armour, and to strive for the mastery in war, then this temptation may be fatal to the independence which springs from energy and self-sacrifice, and a nation steeped in such pleasures runs the risk of being enslaved by a more energetic and encroaching neighbour. But there is another side to the medal. The gifted nation sinks, it is true, but in dying leaves a glorious track of light in its wake, and in the end makes a captive of its conqueror. Such was the destiny of Greece, which passed through so many phases of excellence and distinction before the symptoms of decline set in; and even when national decline had established itself, the race continued to exercise a wide sway on foreign ground. Indeed, it is a question whether the Hellenic race has not far more reason to be proud of what it has done for others, than what it did for itself. So restless and versatile a people could not exist solely for the benefit of their own nationality. In the one case the career opened to them was narrow, confined and exclusive, as in its Dorian manifestations; in the other, the Ionian, it was practically unlimited in its aspirations: hence, even at this day, we sit at the feet of Athens, our acknowledged mistress and our guide, the source and reference of all higher knowledge. The marvellous triumphs of modern science should not make us despise these sources of ancient wisdom because they are somewhat old-fashioned. What is in itself eternally good and beautiful can never stale by repetition. The light which has been travelling for thousands of years from a fixed star to our sphere, is no less pure light than if it were only generated

yesterday. But antiquity has a prescriptive claim superior to discovery, which enjoins us to perpetuate the gift. Still, we think, an error may be committed on this ground, through our over-anxiety to make things more complete and perfect than the actual requirement. In the days of Pierre Brumoy and our own English fathers of Greek dramatic criticism, the leading object was to enjoy the good gift as well as to transmit it. Modern æstheticism will not permit us to exercise this very natural indulgence. Our point of view must now be analytic, severe and searching. We must shun the flowery path and settle down to the hard minutiae of philological detail. If the elder generation, therefore, dating from Bentley, Wolf and Heyne, swept the heavens with their telescope, and laid open the beauty of countless stars, the modern school applies the microscope and searches even for baser matter. This disposition, we fancy, not only tends to draw us away from the higher contemplation of the beautiful, but sometimes even shocks our established prepossessions. While it distracts our attention from what is amiable in itself, it leads us to overlook the original purport and intention of the dramatist in composing his work. In short, in our devotion to the exegesis we forget the substance. Still, we are glad to see our own English critics of late years taking the field on this ground and endeavouring to make as wide a cast of the discus as some of the Germans have done, who now for seventy years have claimed the right to hold the leading place. It should be some encouragement to new adventurers to remember that English scholars virtually led the way, and were in some respects, if not the teachers, at least the inspirers, of the great Teutonic school to whom the world is so much indebted, not only for patient exploration, but for original methods of research. To say nothing of Bishop Warburton's daring adventure into regions of inquiry which seemed almost perilous for an orthodox foot to touch, or the happy conjecture of Robert Wood, out of which Wolf built up an impregnable theory, or the interesting tentatives in philology undertaken by the grandfather of the present Earl of Malmesbury, we have a legion of great names to show who held sway long before the German school gained a firm footing:—Bentley and Porson, Clarke, Stanley, Jodrell, Barnes, Askew, Tyrwhitt, Heath, Musgrave, Wakefield, and others, whose comments on the Greek dramatists are still of great interest to those who are not altogether averse to a reference to bygone days. A spirit of calmness pervades these old-fashioned tomes, and as we look into their page we seem raised above the level of mundane agitations, and to live more thoroughly in the past—to which effect no doubt the use of the universal Latin greatly contributes. In one respect, however

we have had—and possibly may still continue to have—an advantage over the Germans; namely, in regarding antiquity in a more practical and less recluse point of view than is their wont. In short, we ought to have among us, now as in former days, scholars who are less of the professor and more of the man of the world. Gibbon served in the Hampshire Militia and in the House of Commons; and Grote was for many years a reluctant clerk in his father's banking-house in the City before he had the leisure to put his hand to literary work. If Dr. Jebb seriously means to give the world an edition of Sophocles in seven octavo volumes, with such copious readings and interpretations, a "Lexicon Sophocleum," and a literal prose translation all on the same page—such as we find in the specimen he has already presented to us—all we can say is, that so arduous and exhaustive a labour deserves encouragement. If the reader is a little disconcerted in seeing what he has here to face, he will at least have the consolation of knowing that the path has been smoothed for him in a fashion which fifty or sixty years ago was within the reach of none who ventured to explore this interesting ground.

The late successful reproduction of Greek plays at Cambridge, with all their scenic and musical adjuncts, is a remarkable sign of the interest which in our day attaches to the ancient drama, and one more evidence of that wonderful capacity for *μίμησις* which Aristotle has told us is so inherent in man. This triumph of artistic skill is only in keeping with the march of modern verbal criticism; and those who have vexed themselves over a disputed passage in a Greek drama may here find a pleasant source of recreation, and a relief from their toil, and perhaps approach nearer the actual position of those numerous strangers who flocked into Athens during the festival of the Great Dionysia to take their seat in the theatre, than they could possibly hope to do amid the distractions and embarrassments of textual emendation.



## ART. III.—GORDON'S JOURNALS.\*

LORD HARTINGTON, in speaking on August 29 at Rossendale, in Lancashire, made a sort of defence of the late Government with reference to its somewhat curious Egyptian policy. His otherwise admirable speech was not very convincing in that connection. He said :—

I don't say that there may not have been faults and mistakes committed, but I say that on the whole the direction, the aim, and the object of our policy in Egypt *has been right*, and that so far as it was possible to judge what the policy of our opponents was from their speeches and from their letters—as far as we can judge—I say their policy appears to have been wrong. The system which we found in Egypt, and which broke to pieces in our hands, was not a system of our own creation (hear, hear). We went to Egypt because we had engagements which we thought we were bound to fulfil, and because we had an interest—and we thought that our Indian possessions and our colonies had an interest—that anarchy should not prevail in that country.

He then went on to compare that policy with the supposed policy of the opponents of the late Government, and concluded to his own satisfaction that we were better off to-day from having followed the policy of the late Government “in spite of its failures,” and “notwithstanding the faults and errors which might have been made in its course, than we would have been if power had been in the hands of the Conservatives.”† Well, we are not seriously concerned to discuss this question. It seems to us one of the smallest of satisfactions to feel that some other body might have done worse for us than the person we are complaining of; and it is rather “throwing up the sponge,” to use a phrase which the present Secretary of State for India has made Parliamentary, to conduct a defence by showing that a crime charged might have been committed by another person in the same position, or that even a more atrocious crime might have been committed. A more pertinent inquiry for us, and, we should have thought, too, for the electors of the North-east Division of Lancashire, is whether the late Government formed a right conception of their true policy in connection with Egypt, and whether they carried out that policy with the sense and honesty which the country had a right to expect of them. We

\* “The Journals of Major-Gen. C. G. Gordon, C.B., at Kartoum.” Printed from the Original MSS. Introduction and Notes by A. Egmont Hake, Author of “The Story of Chinese Gordon,” &c. London. 1885.

† Mr. Gladstone in his Manifesto goes even further than Lord Hartington in admitting errors of judgment. His defence, however, is not more conclusive.

confess that we do not think, from our recent experiences, that it is right to argue from what a party has said when in opposition to what would have been its policy had it been in power, and we find it difficult to believe that any official persons could have made a more miserable fiasco in connection with Egyptian affairs than Lord Hartington's clients. Let us say here, however, that we do not think that the last sentence which we quoted from Lord Hartington's speech embodies an erroneous statement. We agree with him that this country had substantial interests in Egypt—that our Indian possessions and our colonies too had interests in Egypt, and one of the paramount interests was that "anarchy should not prevail in that country." We have already, in these pages, discussed the earlier phases of the political conduct of this country in Egypt, and it is not necessary to go back upon the embroiled questions which were presented after the theatrical overthrow of Arabi. We made a good deal too much of that easy victory, and took too little account of the duties and responsibilities which that military "walk over" left on our hands. In a former article in this REVIEW, we pointed out that in having taken active measures to prevent anarchy in Egypt, we had put our hand to a very awkward plough, and that however much we might desire to turn back and withdraw our troops, and pursue the masterly policy of what General Gordon in these Journals calls "ratting out," or what the newspapers have called the "policy of scuttle," that such a course was not competent to us, if we had any regard to our real duties and our real interests in Egypt. We ventured then to point out that our duty was not done when we had protected Egypt from the anarchy which might have resulted from the small revolt of the captains, but that we must protect that country against the much greater evils which would result from the aggression of the Mahdi. When that article on Egypt was written, the revolt in the Soudan was a comparatively small matter. Up to that time the Mahdi had defeated some small detachments of troops, far inferior in numbers to his own, but shortly before the article was printed he had annihilated Hicks Pasha's army, and had extended his influence and power in the Soudan to an extraordinary extent. It was then we warned the Government that their work in Egypt was only beginning. We had suffered the fellahen conscripts to be dragged in chains from their homes to swell the tattered ranks of General Hicks' army, at a time when we were paramount in Egypt, and when we were pretending that we were keeping faith with the European Powers by not establishing a protectorate. Then "take"—to quote from these Journals of General Gordon:—

Take the Tokar business : had Baker been supported by, say 500

men, he would not have been defeated; yet after he was defeated you go and send a force to relieve the town. Had Baker been supported by these 500 men he would, in all probability, have been victorious, and would have pushed on to Berber, and, once there, Berber would not have fallen. What was right to do in *March* was right to do in *February*. We sent an expedition in *March*; so we ought to have sent it in *February*; and thus the worst of it was that Baker having been defeated, *when you did send your expedition to Tokar*, Baker's force no longer existed, and his guns resist me at Berber.\*

It was in this way that we culpably suffered the head and front of the rebellion in the Soudan to become really menacing to Lower Egypt. And the shilly-shally of our earlier policy left us no free will in our latter conduct. It was under these circumstances that we pointed out that our duties in Egypt were increasing. We had saved the country from what we said would lead to anarchy, although there might have been differences of opinion as to that; and now we had been the means of raising a revolt in the Soudan in comparison with which Arabi's conspiracy was only child's play. That this was the doing of the late Government of England people are apt to forget; but the fact is indubitable. It is worth while noting in this place that our Government ought to have known the unstable state of the equilibrium of the forces which produce peace in the Soudan. They had at any rate the means of knowledge. If General Gordon was the right man to send to Kartoum in January, 1884, to report to the Government, his opinions upon the state of affairs in the Soudan were worth listening to. General Gordon had seen the storm-cloud from afar. In 1876, when he had determined to resign the office of Governor of the Equator, which he held under the Egyptian Government, he wrote: "Things have come to such a pass in these Mussulman countries that a crisis must come about soon." When he left the country, after having ruled over the Soudan for three years, in April, 1879, he said, "If the liberation of the slaves takes place in 1884, and if the present system of Government goes on, there cannot fail to be a revolt of the whole country."† It was therefore not without warning that the Government put its head into a noose and drew the cord tighter and tighter by every one of its silly struggles. From this point, however, the policy of the Government was as hand to mouth as ever. When they saw that the task of holding the Soudan was a difficult one, they

\* Vol. i. p. 162.

† See also, in confirmation of these views, the note on "The Insurrection of the False Prophet, 1831-33," in the appendices to these volumes, pp. 456-458.



determined that Egypt should abandon it, and because the Egyptian Ministers of that time did not view the matter in the same light there was a Ministerial crisis. This was a somewhat strong measure for England to take. It was in Egypt to protect its own interests in the water communication between this country and its Indian possessions, and because it had become more mixed up with Egyptian affairs than the extreme wing of the Radical party liked, it determined to simplify the problem by making Egypt abandon its most important province. And to make this step practicable, the Government of the time was dismissed by England's puppet, the Khedive, and a more pliable Ministry took its place. This, again, was the way in which our late Government carried out its promises to Europe—that they had no thought of annexation or of establishing a protectorate. They did not seem to see that this action upon their part was another wriggle which made the noose more secure. They were becoming more and more deeply pledged to the poor country which they had helped into its miserable plight, to protect it against external and internal foes, and it became more and more imperative that “anarchy should not prevail in that country.” But one thing even our Government, knocking about as it was from pillar to post in diplomacy, could not propose. It was easy to say you must give up the Soudan, because the Soudan has washed its hands (in blood) of you; but it could not well say, You must leave all the garrisons you have placed there to their fate. It ultimately came very much to that, but such cold-blooded news had to be broken to the country. At that time, however, the policy was to “rescue and retire.” How to get them out was no doubt a difficult question. But the rule in Government is, “when in doubt” have somebody to make a report to you. And consequently the late Government, on the suggestion, it is said, of one of the daily newspapers, appointed General Gordon to report “on the military situation in the Soudan, and on the measures which it might be deemed advisable to take for the security of the Egyptian garrisons still holding positions in that country, and for the safety of the European population in Kartoum, and further upon the manner in which the safety and good administration of the Egyptian Government of the ports on the sea-coast could be best secured.”

There is no question that in selecting General Gordon for that office they had hit upon the right man. Very few such men as Charles Gordon are produced in a generation. These times are prolific only of what the Americans call “no account men.” But Gordon was a man of undoubted genius, and possessed, what was more regarded in earlier times than it is in our days, an unbounded influence over the men with whom he was brought

into contact. A powerful magnet brings all other magnets within its sphere into relation with itself, and there are some personalities which have a similar power in relation to their fellow-men. Gordon was made to command and influence others; he was brave to a fault; he was as honest as the day; he was as strict a disciplinarian as a frost, and yet he was tender and gentle as a woman. He had, too, a deep religious sentiment without which no man will succeed in largely influencing masses of men. This is not the place to speak of his achievements in China, indeed "achievements" almost seems too cold a word to apply to the miracles he performed in that country. Prudent peddling persons who were associated with him at that time thought Gordon was "mad." It was only because there was no common measure by which they could judge of him; and the epithet "mad" is the compliment which all the foolish are always applying to the really great ones of the earth. We should have thought less of Gordon, if some common-place persons had not accused him of insanity or of "having a devil." Here, however, we have rather to do with those doings which justified his being called "Soudan Gordon" instead of "Chinese Gordon," as he had been called in the past; for it was his unparalleled knowledge of the Soudan, the immense influence he had acquired in that country, which made his selection by the Government to report an act of wisdom. That in this they did wisely we do not doubt. That his appointment would have resulted in the happiest issues we firmly believe, had not the Government distrusted the man they had selected, had they not thwarted him and obstructed him at every turn. Of that phase of their policy we must say something hereafter. Here, however, we want to show why Gordon was the right man in the right place when he was appointed to report on Soudan matters to the late Government. A very brief sketch will establish that point.

In the year 1874 Gordon was appointed by the Khedive Governor of the Equator. He accepted the perilous office with one object in view, and that was to benefit the people over whom he was set in authority, and he believed that that was to be done by giving freedom to all. No man who was not possessed of the highest aims, the most indomitable courage, and of the very largest personal resources, would have undertaken such a task at such a time. The condition of the country over which he was to rule—which he was to attempt to regenerate—was terrible. It was the happy hunting-ground of the slave-dealer, whose inhuman trade was winked at and encouraged at Cairo.\*

---

\* Wars were frequently fomented between rival chiefs upon the tattered verge of civilization for the purposes of supplying the slave markets.

Seven-eighths of the population of the Soudan were slaves. Parents would sell their children for cattle. The people were ashamed of nothing, but they were afraid of everything. No man sowed because there was no security that he would reap what he had sown. Safety of travel through those savage lands was secured only to companies composed of not less than 100 persons. Laws were never heard of, unless the motto that "plunder is no offence," which the Pashas had inculcated and illustrated, was a law. This system of barbarism existed not in spite of the Governors and Vakeels or what not, but by means of their active connivance and under their "direct patronage." Out of this system they made their gains. It was over this crawling pest of humanity that Gordon was made ruler; it was through these polluted channels that he had to try to administer justice to the people. A hopeless task it would have seemed to most men to get order out of this human chaos. But Gordon set himself at once to do two things—to put an end to the contraband of human flesh, and to gain the confidence of the people. He ventured alone and unarmed into the midst of those whose nefarious trade in human bodies, and in truth in human souls, he had come to abolish. He demonstrated at once even to these people that he was a man of consummate bravery, and the savage can understand courage if he can understand nothing else. But he was no mere bravo, carrying his life in his hand. He set himself to introduce the comely acts of peace. He made the sowing of grain safe. He supplied the temporary wants of those who had nothing to live upon. He gave work to those who were idle, and he taught the people the use of money. But this was not enough. The slow results which followed these labours did not satisfy him, for he felt that he was rolling a stone up a hill. All his plans were met with organized obstruction. No one knows what obstruction can do until he has tried to inaugurate reform in Oriental peoples. From the highest, such as Ismail Pasha Yacoub, the Governor-General of the Soudan, down to the lowest Vakeel or Sandjac, he found that his plans for the deliverance of the people, for the establishment of a stable and just government, were counteracted, retarded and obstructed by those whose real duty it was to further his designs. He felt, too, that unless he was to remain permanently, or unless his own maxims and rules were to be acted upon by his successors, he might really be doing harm to those he was seeking to benefit. It is only too evident that if a man becomes a man of peace before the laws are strong enough to put an end to that class of men who live by war and plunder, he is only making himself an easier and more tempting victim to the robber and the spoiler. This pressed upon Gordon; it was because he saw no way to insure a permanence of good rule

in the Soudan that he resigned his position as Governor of the Equator in 1876.

But his task was not by any means done. He was immediately afterwards appointed Governor-General of the Soudan. The obstructive Ismail Pasha Yacoub was removed, and Gordon ruled with almost supreme power over a country 1,600 miles long by 700 miles wide. He had set himself to put down slavery, but he knew that unless that was associated with the establishment of a proper system of government, the result would be a revolt and rebellion, and as one of the first steps in the direction of good government, he set himself to improve the communications. Gordon was no mere philanthropic visionary, but a very practical man. He knew that the mere suppression of the slave trade was not enough. The slave trade he recognized as a kind of savage government. If he was to do away with that he must have some more humane institution to put in its cruel place. And he set himself to solve this difficult practical problem with a will. There were sights and sounds enough to shock a man of even ordinary humanity, and Gordon had an exceedingly tender heart. He saw that the people were being goaded to revolt. He saw that lands which would, to use the American expression, have "laughed in the harvest if they had been tickled with the hoe," were lying waste, that thousands of human bones were bleaching in the sun, where slaves had dropped out of the labouring caravans, and had died where they had fallen, while the vultures scarcely waited for their prey. It is difficult, even when one writes about such matters, to keep one's blood temperate. But one can well understand how such things as these made his hot blood boil. He saw, too, that it was Zubair who was the moving spirit in this infernal plot against humanity, and that it was necessary to put an end at once to his terrible influence. Zubair was safe in so-called captivity in Cairo; but Suleiman his son could be, and was, crushed. The history of this, too, savours, as so much of Gordon's history does, of the miraculous. Had his work, so well begun, been honestly continued, much might have been effected for these miserable populations, and much that has since shocked the sense and the humanity of Europe, might have been prevented. Gordon ruled as Governor-General of the Soudan for three years, and in that time he had succeeded in much. He had disbanded the Bashi-Bazouks; he had got rid of the Mudirs and Pashas who had sought only to promote their own interests, without regarding the interests of the suffering people; and he had succeeded in endearing himself to the people of the country, who rightly recognized in Gordon a friend and a would-be saviour. He left at the end of his short and salutary reign because the whole of the affairs at Cairo had

put on a changed complexion. Tewfik was in Ismail's place. The Dual Control was gone. The influence of the Pashas was again felt at the capital, and the new ruler was in favour of oppression, of backsheesh, of the courbash, and all other machinery of tyranny. Under the circumstances he could not remain. He left, but he left behind him a great mark in the grateful remembrance of the poor distracted people he had befriended.

Under these circumstances there can be no question that the late Government did well, in the foolish trouble they were in, to look to Gordon for help. But they looked to entirely the wrong quarter if they expected in Gordon to find a facile tool in the hands of their vacillation and indecision. This, however, is really what they seemed to think they had found. Just let us see, with the assistance of the careful editor of these Journals, what the late Government asked Gordon to do, and what they afterwards expected of him.

As we have seen, they appointed General Gordon to report to them. Domestic questions, when they become troublesome, are placed on a shelf, which is sometimes called a Select Committee and sometimes a Royal Commission. In foreign affairs, when they get knotted, a Special Commissioner is appointed to report upon the situation, and to advise as to means of unravelling the tangled skein of affairs.\* But the instructions to General Gordon went further, as Mr. Egmont Hake properly points out. This clause was in his instructions: "You will consider yourself authorized and instructed to perform such other duties as the Egyptian Government may desire to entrust to you, and as may be communicated to you by Sir E. Baring." No sooner was Gordon in Egypt than the Egyptian Government appointed him Governor-General of the Soudan, the country they had under England's instructions abandoned, and his instructions were now no longer to report, but "to evacuate the Soudan." The Firman contained this amongst other things: "We do hereby appoint you Governor-General of the Soudan, and we trust that you will carry out our good intentions for the establishment of justice and order, and that you will assure the peace and prosperity of the people of the Soudan by maintaining the security of the roads open, &c."† It was in attempting to carry out this great duty and humane and noble task that Gordon spent eleven miserable months in Kartoum. That they were sad times may in part be

---

\* The number of Special Commissioners which have reported upon Egyptian affairs is a fair measure of the helplessness of our Government. Of course nothing or next to nothing has come of any of their Reports.

† Vol. i. Introduction, p. xxix.

gathered from these journals of some of his last months.\* He was surrounded by treachery, plotted against by all, unsupported, nay, worse, thwarted and brow-beaten by the Government which had sent him. He was even insulted by being told to imitate the Government which had accredited him, which had scuttled out of every position—he was advised to scuttle too. But that was not only physically out of the question, it was morally impossible to a man with Gordon's conscience. It was then that the Government made a mistake. But not only were the times "most bad," there was no "hope of better to be had." Gordon often had glimpses of prophecy. He had, too, perspicuous glances of what the end would be. Could anything by anticipation more correctly describe events than this sentence of his written beforehand: "It is of course on the cards that Kartoum is taken under the nose of the Expeditionary Force, which will be just too late."† Or than these, almost his last written words, dated December 14, 1884: "Now, mark this, if the Expeditionary Force, and I ask no more than two hundred men, does not come in ten days, the town may fall; and I have done my best for the honour of my country. Good-bye."‡ At the end of these eleven months he died, and we may say of him, as he said of Stewart and Power, that he was "as much a martyr as Peter or Paul."§

But even these instructions to which we have referred, explicit enough as they seem, were not all that he received. Upon January 26, 1884, the Khedive wrote to him that "the object of his mission to the Soudan was to carry into execution the evacuation of those territories and to withdraw the troops." "We trust," the Khedive continued, "that your Excellency will adopt the most effective measures for the accomplishment of your mission in this respect, and that after completing the evacuation you will take the necessary steps for establishing an organized Government in the different provinces of the Soudan for the maintenance of order and the cessation of all disasters and incitements to revolt." Now all this his biographer, we think rightly, believes he would have done, had he not been thwarted and obstructed by our late Government. It was Gordon's fate, it is the fate of all great and good men, to be obstructed in the performance of their high functions and noble duties by the villains and fools in the world. While in Egypt as Governor of the Equator, and subsequently as Governor-General of the

---

\* It is scarcely worth while to prove this by quotations, but here are some words, written on December 6, which bear it out: "To-morrow it will be 270 days—nine months—that we have endured one continuous misery and anxiety."—*Journals*, vol. ii. p. 385.

† Vol. i. p. 191.

‡ Vol. ii. p. 395.

§ *Ibid.* p. 285.

Soudan from 1874 to 1879, he was obstructed, and had all his plans for good frustrated by the Pashas who pulled the wires—golden wires—at Cairo. During these eleven sad months we have been speaking of, some of which are bitterly chronicled in the pages before us, he was checked and balked in almost as systematic a way by the Government of England. The editor of these volumes believes that had the late Government been content to do nothing, had they merely withheld their support instead of doing that and interfering and negating every project Gordon proposed—had they been passive instead of apparently actively antagonistic, Gordon might have succeeded in the mission he had undertaken, and might have been alive to-day.\* Had he been alive we suspect we should have heard nothing of the mean apology which the Government has ventured to put forward for themselves. They say now that Gordon had peculiar views. Well, from the Government standpoint of indecision, we can understand that anything like fixity of purpose would be regarded as peculiar. And they say too that Gordon was disobedient to orders. There are few depths of meanness to which the apologists of Governments will not stoop; but we did think that this last act was beyond the miscreant power of sycophants. That they should by their indecision,† by their folly, have rendered the evacuation impossible, that they should have sent expeditions to rescue and retire which always arrived in time to retire without rescuing, was in Gordon's words "a farce if it did not deal with men's lives," but that they should, after marring the prospects of one of the best men and ablest soldiers this century has seen, attempt to detract from his fame by the paltry meanness we have mentioned, is unworthy even of political morality.‡ That Gordon was justified in all he did, and that the imputation which has been made against him is utterly unfounded, appears not only from the careful Introduction to these volumes but from the Journals themselves. Mr. Egmont Hake shows conclusively that there was no disobedience upon Gordon's part of any order to which he was

\* Vol. i. Introduction, p. xli.

† Their indecision was even more evident to Gordon, who was a man of promptitude and whose will was quick to perform what his mind was wise to conceive. Thus, he says on October 5, 1884: "No one can judge the waste of money and expense of life in the present expedition; it is an utter waste of both, but it is simply due to the indecisions of our Government," vol. i. p. 149; and the Journals are full of similar sentences."

‡ Gordon had ample reasons for his low opinion of Governmental morality. "We are," he says in one place, "an honest nation, but our diplomatists are conies and not officially honest," vol. i. p. 22. "I hate Her Majesty's Government for leaving the Soudan after having caused all its troubles," vol. i. p. 28. "I must say I hate our diplomatists," vol. i. p. 223.

bound to attend, and that General Gordon never went beyond the limits of his commission. Such a telegram as that of Lord Granville, "that undertaking these military expeditions was beyond the scope of the commission he held, and at variance with the policy which was the purpose of his mission to the Soudan,"\* only indicates that either Lord Granville did not know the scope of Gordon's commission, or that he sought to cancel the Firman of the Khedive by implication. Probably the former is the most charitable explanation.† But it is possible that they also regarded him as disobedient in not leaving Kartoum when they told him that he was free to go. It was the bad luck of the late Government to flounder on from one position of doubt and difficulty into another position where their doubts and difficulties were greater. It perhaps always is the fate of those whose policy waits on events instead of making events wait upon their policy. For the nonce the Government was saved by Gordon's journey to Kartoum. But then, after they had rejected every proposal he made with a view to the main objects with which he was charged, both by our own and the Egyptian Government, and had in that way tied his hands in Kartoum—a situation in which, if in any, a man of judgment ought to have been free to act—they discovered that they had to account to the country for General Gordon's life; and, forgetting all about the garrisons he went to evacuate, forgetting all about the European population of Kartoum, and the thousands of loyal adherents for whose safety the heart of the Khedive ached,‡ they, with a view of extricating themselves from their difficulty, advised General Gordon to get out of Kartoum. That they advised this course at a time when it was impossible, was only of a piece with the usual policy of the Government. How this struck Gordon can be gathered, not without a sense of indignation against the Government, by those who will read these Journals. In one place he says:—

I do not question the policy of Her Majesty's Government in not

\* Earl Granville to Mr. Egerton, April 23, 1884—"Egypt," No. 12 (1884), No. 36.

† Gordon shows that he did not credit the Government with too intimate a knowledge of these matters in a satirical passage which is worth quoting in a note. It describes an imaginary scene in the House of Lords. "The noble Marquis asked what the policy of Her Majesty's Government was? It was as if he asked the policy of a log floating down stream—it was going to sea, as any one with an ounce of brains could see. Well, that was the policy of it, only it was a decided policy and a straightforward one to drift along and take advantage of every circumstance. His lordship deprecated the frequent questioning on subjects which his lordship said he knew nothing about, and further, did not care to know anything about."

‡ See *Pall Mall Gazette* Extra, "Too Late," No. 14.

[Vol. CXXIV. No. CCXLVIII.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LXVIII. No. II. D D



keeping the Soudan. It is a wretched country, and not worth keeping. I do not pretend even to judge the policy of letting the garrisons, &c., perish; but I do say I think that Her Majesty's Government ought to have taken the bold step of speaking out and saying, 'SHIFT FOR YOURSELF' in *March* when I could have done so, and not now, when I am in honour bound to the people after six months' bothering warfare. Not only did Baring not say '*Shift for yourself*,' but he put a veto upon my going to the Equator—*vide* his telegrams in Stewart's Journal. I say this because no one deploras more the waste of money and life in this expedition, and no one can realize its difficulties better than myself; but, owing to what has passed, owing to indecision, we are in for it, and the only thing now to do is to see how to get out of it with honour and the least expense possible—and I see no other way than by giving the country to the Turks.\*

And in another place he says: "As for *evacuation*, it is one thing, as for 'ratting out,' it is another. I am quite of advice as to No. 1 (as we have not the decision to keep the country), but I will be no party to No. 2 (this 'rat' business)—1st. Because it is dishonourable; 2nd. Because it is not *possible* (*which will have more weight*); therefore, if it is going to be No. 2 the troops had better not come beyond Berber till the question of what will be done is settled."† But those who desire to see how ill-founded the charge of disobedience is, must read these pages for themselves.

But while the Government by this fine instrument of innuendo have attempted to put the dead man in the wrong, they have, during the whole course of this miserable business, been putting themselves in the wrong at every turn. To-day we may forget their innumerable blunders; but history has a long memory. To-day we are so mixed up with the recent events, so busy with the events which are our guests to-day, the blood relations of those that have just gone, that we cannot be wholly impartial. But when our times are seen from a distance, when the heat of the contest has passed away, posterity will be able to judge these Governments rightly, and we venture to prophesy that these new times will not acquit our late Government of having conducted a most foolish policy with reference both to the Soudan and General Gordon. Out of their own mouths they can, as the present editor shows, be condemned. Mr. Gladstone said, "It was our duty, whatever we might feel, to beware of interfering with Gordon's plans, and before we adopted any scheme that should bear that aspect (*i.e.*, the aspect of interference), to ask whether *in his judgment* there would or would not be such an interference." And Sir Charles Dilke said: "He" (Gordon) "is better able to form a judgment than anybody. He will have, I make

---

\* Vol. i. p. 150.

† *Ibid.* p. 80.

no doubt, every support he can need in the prosecution of his mission." Yet it will scarcely be credited that these were the men who refused every one of Gordon's requests, who set themselves to thwart him at every turn, who, instead of treating him as their trusted representative to evacuate the Soudan and to restore order to the distracted desert, treated him as an enemy, whose every move should be checked and check-mated. A few illustrations will show that this was what they did. Gordon thought it might at some time be advantageous if he visited the Mahdi, but Sir E. Baring gave him a positive order from Her Majesty's Government that he was on no account to do so. This was the person who, according to the views of the Cabinet, was better able than anybody to form a judgment. Gordon proposed to go direct from Kartoum to the Bahr Gazelle and the equatorial provinces, but the Government refused to allow him to go further than Kartoum.\* We have already seen Gordon suggesting that 3,000 Turkish troops in British pay should be sent to the Soudan,† but Her Majesty's Government, advised by Sir E. Baring, disapproved of the measure and the troops were not sent. Gordon had all along been of opinion that some form of government was essential to the safety of the Soudan, and he had always, as we have said, recognized the slave-trade organization as a kind of government. He found himself in Kartoum in the middle of the Soudan, and anarchy was all round it. He suggested wisely on the whole, that Zubair should be appointed as his successor or as his coadjutor. He gave some excellent reasons why that course should be taken, and he reiterated his request over and over again, but his requests were invariably met with refusals. "Her Majesty's Government would not permit the Khedive to make this appointment."‡ He requested that Indian Moslem troops should be sent to Wady Halfa. Of course this request was refused. In March he asked for 100 British troops to be sent to Assouan or to Wady Halfa.§ Sir E. Baring said he would not risk sending so small a body; but no larger body was sent.|| It was also discovered that the climate would exercise an injurious effect on the troops; and of course the troops were not sent. After the fall of Berber, Sir Evelyn Baring telegraphed to Lord Granville that it had now become of the utmost importance not only to open the road between Suakin and Berber, but to come to terms with the tribes between Berber

\* See Earl Granville to Sir E. Baring, February 11, 1884—"Egypt," No. 12, No. 4.

† Vol. i. p. 136, *note*.

‡ *Ibid.* Introduction, p. xxxviii.

§ "Egypt," No. 12 (1884), Enclosures 5, No. 239.

|| "Egypt," No. 12, No. 170. Sir E. Baring to Earl Granville.

and Kartoum. This had been suggested by Gordon more than once, but of course only met with refusals. Now Lord Granville replies to Sir E. Baring: "General Gordon had several times suggested a movement on Wady Halfa which might support him by threatening an advance on Dongola, and under the present circumstances at Berber this might be advantageous." It is scarcely necessary to accumulate instances, but one more may be given. Gordon came to the conclusion that the "Mahdi must be smashed." \* We think that it is probable that any one with Gordon's means of information would have come to the same conclusion. The object of Egypt and of this country was to extricate the garrisons from their threatening environment, and to establish some form of government which would secure order in the Soudan, with the view that the Soudan should no longer be a threat to Lower Egypt. To do the former, without at the same time accomplishing the latter, Gordon saw would be futile. To rescue and retire at once, or "skedaddle" as he called it, would be to strengthen the Mahdi immensely, and to invite invasion into the Egyptian borders. To make Egypt safe we must make England respected, and to secure respect at the hands of the people of the Soudan, it was necessary to show England's power. It was necessary therefore that the Mahdi should be smashed. But Her Majesty's Government, who thought that Gordon alone was in a proper position to form a judgment of the situation, declined to countenance any such proceeding. Ultimately they came to the same opinion as General Gordon. Their own general used the same phrases, and wrote to natives that, "You know Gordon Pasha's countrymen are not likely to turn back from any enterprise they have begun until it has been fully accomplished. When that happy event takes place, I hope to be able to establish you (Cassim el Mousse Pasha) amongst your own people, and that you and all others will realize that the English nation does not forget those who serve it faithfully." We say again that if men's lives had not been in question, it would be as laughable as a farce. Lord Wolseley's letter reads like the finest irony; for if the late Government have proved anything to the people of the Soudan, it has been precisely that the countrymen of Gordon are likely to turn back from an enterprise before it has been accomplished, and that the English nation does forget those who serve it faithfully. No, not the English nation. That with all their diplomacy they could not prove. The English nation will hold Gordon's name and fame in admiring memory for centuries, in spite of the failures which were forced upon him by the late Government. Do not let it

---

\* And see Journals, vol. i. p. 87, and vol. i. p. 138.

be supposed that we indict the Government for more than Gordon himself laid to their charge. It is, we think, a fault of those in office to have no definite and straightforward policy. It is a fault to time-serve the crotchet-mongers of the party. It is a fault when a Government has found a capable servant in whose judgment they can rely, not to rely upon it, but to thwart his every action. It is a fault always to be too late in doing even the right thing. All these faults we think the Government committed. We have said that some of the members of the Government party have attempted to whitewash themselves by black-washing Gordon. That that baseness will not stand them in any stead after these volumes have been read by the public, we are confident.

But it is pleasant to leave this question, and to turn to another aspect of these volumes. Of course they cannot fail to be sad reading to those who regard the country as in some sense responsible for the death of the excellent man who penned these memorials of those painful months. At the same time we think these Journals are excellent reading—some, indeed, of the wholesomest pages we have met with for some time. Some one has said that there is no medicine like a good friend, and we can understand that the daily high yet familiar intercourse with a really great man must be an excellent tonic. It was Steele—was it not?—who spoke of a certain lady “whom to have known was a liberal education?” When personal intercourse is impossible, the next best thing is to be let into the real confidences of such an one by written words. Here, then, we have this. Of course, the fact that a journal is written from day to day, and must necessarily contain many trivial matters, takes from the value of the work as an æsthetic whole. But while, as a mere literary performance, this may not come up to our ideal, on the other hand, there is a reality about it, an earnestness, an honesty, which, in our eyes, transcends the merits of more carefully ordered compositions.\* The fault of most written matters is that

---

\* We have noted here and there errors which might, we think, have been corrected in proof. This sentence is scarcely grammatical: “They might have gone down together had they mutually have known of one another’s departure,” vol. i. p. 11. On page 30 the word “quick” is printed instead of “quickly.” On page 153 “one of the men say,” should read “one of the men says.” And one of the editor’s own sentences in the Introduction (p. xxii) is, we think, ambiguous: “Had the Egyptian Government watched and warded off the regeneration of the slavers after Gordon dealt his final blow on Suleiman’s death,” &c. The sentence, too, on p. xxvi. which begins “So that for eleven months,” &c., is made nonsense of by the words “and to spare” occurring in it without connection. On p. xxii., too, in the sentence which begins with the words “The events which followed” on p. xxi., there is a superfluous “by.” But these are small matters and very easily corrected.

the man who writes is a master of expression, but is ignorant of facts or incapable of deeds. It is in this way that most literature fails; for the real workers in the world can usually work only with one tool, it may be a sword or it may be a pen, but it is seldom both. In these Journals we find some excellent straightforward English, which never fails of its purpose of making the facts appear, and which at the same time brings out strongly the one sterling fact of Gordon's personality. This is not the place to praise him, even if he needed praise, but it may be worth while to illustrate one or two of his personal traits. Gordon was eminently honest, not only honest in his own acts—a good many of us are that—but too honest to profit by the treacherous acts of others. Here is a sentence which is not preaching, but which is better than many sermons: "Politically and morally, however, it is better for us not to have anything to do with the apostate Europeans in the Arab camp. Treachery never succeeds, and, however matters may end, it is better to fall with clean hands than to be mixed up with dubious acts and dubious men. Maybe it is better for us to fall with honour than to gain the victory with dishonour, and in this view the Ulemas of the town are agreed; they will have nought to do with the proposals of treachery."\* This has some sadness in the light of later events. He is so brave as to be able to confess to fear. "For my part I am always frightened, and very much so. I fear the future of all engagements. It is not the fear of death—that is past, thank God—but I fear defeat and its consequences. I do not believe a bit in this calm unmoved man."† Here is what seems to us an excellent piece of advice: "I think if, instead of 'Minor Tactics,' or books on art of war, we were to make our young officers study 'Plutarch's Lives,' it would be better; there we see men (unsupported by any true belief—pure pagans), making, *as a matter of course*, their lives a sacrifice; but in our days it is the highest merit not to run away."‡ Everyone who knew him knew what a kind heart he had. And here we find him remorseful often for some of the harshnesses which were thrust upon him by his sense of duty. Here is only one illustration: "I have led the officers and officials the lives of dogs while I have been up here; it is spurs in their flanks every day, nothing can obliterate this ill-treatment from my memory."§ One would think he was speaking of something he had himself suffered. For these things

---

\* Vol. i. p. 6.

† *Ibid.* p. 20.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 26. It is curious to note the affection which most real readers have for "Plutarch's Lives." Montaigne says, "I never settled myself to reading any book of solid learning but Plutarch and Seneca;" Emerson says, "I must think we are more deeply indebted to him than to all the ancient writers;" and Franklin seems to have been of the same opinion as to his uses and merits.

§ *Ibid.* p. 26.

our memories are long; for the sufferings we have caused they are generally short enough. "This morning, October 13, 1884, some twelve of those arrested and allowed to stay in their houses are to be taken to the barracks. I hate these arrests, but we can scarcely doubt so many informants."\* There are, too, here and there streaks of genial humour in these Journals,† which make the whole of the black texture, ending, as we know, with his tragic death, even more lurid, but at the same time they raise *the man* in the opinion of those who only through these pages become familiar with him. No man can be complete unless he can laugh, and many of the passages in these Journals, sometimes humorous, and sometimes satirical, will spread the infection to his readers. It is curious to think of a laugh coming to us from beleagured Kartoum. But we cannot in this place do more than refer the reader to these very wholesome pages. These volumes are issued in no hostile spirit, as the Notes which have been supplied by Sir Henry W. Gordon‡ will show, but they have been issued with the intention of setting the truth before the public. To that, at least, the public are entitled. In doing so they will enable even careless readers to form a just conception of the abilities and character of the man we have lost—from what is in some senses a history of the last two months of the siege of Kartoum, and in some senses an autobiography of Gordon's life during those tragic times. But, of course, as was inevitable, there are glances in these pages at more than the stirring current events, there are glances before and after. And it is impossible we think to read these without at the same time thinking of our policy in Egypt in the past, and also trying to forecast what will be our serious duties in the future. The present Government is new to office, and no doubt it took over no very well ascertained and clearly defined policy with reference to Egyptian affairs. There may be some excuse for them if they "drift" for awhile—if they appoint another Special Commissioner to inquire. They have a lull in affairs in the Soudan in their favour. The sleeping dog of revolt in that country may for a time be let alone. But that we are in smooth waters with reference to the troublous matters which have cost us so much, and in connection with which we have reaped so little, we do not believe. It is no doubt true, that if you neglect duty long enough it ceases to be a duty. There are no longer the garrisons to be relieved. The European inhabitants of Kartoum, for which the

\* Vol. i. p. 193.

† When he went to Egypt first he made it clear that his motto was *hurryat* (liberty), and explained that it meant that no man should interfere with another, that there should be an end of kidnapping and plunder, and an end of the Pashas, and those who objected were told that his motto included *their* liberty to quit.

‡ Pp. 55–56.

Khedive's heart bled, have ceased to be, and hearts can cease to bleed for them. Gordon, whose relief this country peremptorily demanded with no uncertain voice, when it was at last—but too late—aroused to a sense of his situation, is past relief. But our interests in Egypt still remain. We must secure our avenue to India. We are still bound to see that in Egypt “anarchy should not prevail.” To do so, we must still, as Gordon saw, secure some sort of Government for the Soudan. Savagery on the borders of civilization is always a threat. We wish Sir H. Drummond Wolff all success in his mission. It is significant that his mission has taken him to Cairo, through Constantinople, and we shall not be surprised if we hear that the necessary order in the Soudan is to be secured by one of the very expedients which General Gordon pressed upon the late Government, expedients, which, as we see, they persistently rejected. But whatever the future is to be, it will not have the advantage of the services of one who above all others was capable of bringing peace and prosperity to that country, which is only waiting for some wise ruler to enforce upon it its duties towards its neighbours and its duty towards itself. The only memorial of a man is that which he raises to himself, and we have one, which will, we think, be lasting, in these volumes, raised almost by the “dead hand” to Charles Gordon.

---

#### ART. IV.—THE GROWTH OF COLONIAL ENGLAND : AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND.

1. *The Year-Book of Australia for 1885.* Published under the auspices of the Governments of the Australian Colonies, and distributed by them to their various Public Departments. London: Trübner & Co.; Australia: George Robertson & Co., Limited.
2. *Victorian Year-Book for 1883-4.* By H. H. HAYTER, C.M.G., Government Statist of Victoria. Melbourne: John Ferres; London: Trübner & Co.
3. *The Colonial Office List for 1885:* compiled from Official Records, by the permission of the Secretary of State for the Colonies. By EDWARD FAIRFIELD and JOHN ANDERSON, of the Colonial Office. London: Harrison & Sons.
4. *Proceedings of the Royal Colonial Institute.*
5. *South Australia: its History, Productions, and Natural Resources.* By J. P. STOW. Adelaide: E. Spiller.

6. *New Zealand: her Commerce and Resources.* By G. W. GRIFFIN, United States Consul at Auckland. Wellington, New Zealand: G. Didsbury.
7. *Official Handbook of New Zealand.* Parts I., II., III. Edited by the Agent-General. London: Edward Stanford.

IF in the course of the coming ages the centre of power of the English race be shifted from its present home in the British Isles, there is little doubt that it will be transferred to the Antipodes. In an article of the July number of this Review we have seen how the population of British North America has increased from less than 100,000 souls in 1763, when the English rule became dominant, to more than 3,800,000 in 1871, and to 4,600,000 in 1881; but a very large proportion of the people, however loyal they may be, are descendants of races other than the British; whereas, in the colonies—those powerful young States, promising to become *filice potentiores matre potente*—the proportion of the whole population not of British origin is quite insignificant, and the growth of the population is rapid beyond precedent. Already Mr. Hayter, the Victorian Government Statist, having been requested to estimate the probable population of the Australasian colonies a hundred years hence, has ventured to place his estimate so high as 100,000,000! When we remember that the original thirteen States of America contained 3,000,000 inhabitants when they obtained their independence, and that the United States now number no more than 55,000,000 or 56,000,000, though whole States with considerable populations have been constantly absorbed within the union, and that a wonderful flow of immigrants has for many years largely increased the numbers of their citizens, we scarcely anticipate so enormous an increase as Mr. Hayter has estimated to be probable in the case of the Queen's Australasian dominion. Should, however, even one-third of the 100,000,000 be reached, the Australasian population, within two hundred years of the arrival of the first settlers on their continent, will have attained a number actually exceeding the number of the inhabitants of Great Britain at the present date! A hundred years ago no Englishman dwelt on the coasts of the Great South Land, or New Holland, as the continent of Australia was then called. Pitt, at that time Prime Minister, had his attention too fully occupied with affairs happening in every other part of the world to allow of his devoting much thought, if any, to the pregnant discovery of New South Wales. Had it been otherwise, we cannot doubt that so noble a treasure trove would never have been allowed to become, even for a time, little better than a receptacle for the swarming crowds of prisoners who, under the baneful operation of a harsh



penal code, were convicted in such numbers that our prison accommodation proved insufficient. The state of Europe was critical enough to account for the home authorities failing to realize the importance of their new acquisition. It was an acquisition, however, that came very near falling into the possession of France; and though, doubtless, we should have dispossessed her, there would have been one more instance added to the long list of the boasted possessions of Great Britain obtained by force from her neighbours. The fact that so many of our colonies and dependencies have been acquired at a time of warfare involves the necessary corollary that it is open to us to lose them in a similar manner. Certainly the growth of a loyal population of the sturdy British stock affords the best hope that foreign rule may never dominate any portion of the Australian continent. We apprehend, however, that few will dispute the probability, were Great Britain to cease to rank as one of the Great Powers, that the latter would insist upon having a very large share of the magnificent domains still so sparsely populated as is Australia. The area of the continent is estimated to be somewhat under 3,000,000 square miles, but, adding the areas of Tasmania and New Zealand, the whole area amounts to nearly 3,100,000 square miles. The area of the colony of Victoria is slightly smaller than that of Great Britain, the actual difference being 122 square miles. New South Wales is greater by 162 square miles than the combined areas of France, Italy, and Sicily. Queensland is smaller by 4,000 square miles only than the combined areas of Sweden and Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, Portugal, Austro-Hungary, and Greece. South Australia exceeds by nearly 3,000 square miles the combined areas of Austro-Hungary, Germany, Spain, France, Holland, and Denmark, and is 30,000 square miles greater than the area of British India! And Western Australia—in itself comprising one-third of the whole continent—and South Australia together are only 18,000 square miles smaller than the whole of Russia in Europe, including Poland.

On April 3, 1881, that being the day on which the census of the United Kingdom was taken, a simultaneous census of the population was also taken throughout the Australasian colonies, and from the results it appears that on that day those colonies, taken as a whole, contained over 2,800,000 inhabitants, of whom about 2,161,000 were dwelling upon the Australian continent. The following table includes the aboriginal inhabitants, who are, however, rapidly becoming an extinct race. It is computed that in Victoria their numbers—which have been placed as high as 15,000 at the date of the colonization of the district—have dwindled to less than a thousand.

*Table showing the Area and Population of each of the Australasian Colonies in 1871 and 1881.*

Colony.	Area in Square Miles.	Census in 1871* (Dec. 31).	Census in 1881.		
			Males.	Females.	Total.
Victoria . . . . .	87,000	747,000	452,000	419,000	862,000
New South Wales . . . . .	309,000	519,000	411,000	340,000	751,000
Queensland . . . . .	668,000	125,000	126,000	98,000	224,000
South Australia . . . . .	903,000	189,000	153,000	133,000	286,000
Western Australia . . . . .	975,000	25,000	18,000	12,000	32,000
Total . . . . .	2,944,000	1,606,000	1,170,000	995,000	2,165,000
Tasmania . . . . .	26,000	101,000	61,000	54,000	115,000
New Zealand . . . . .	104,000	266,000	293,000	240,000	534,000
Grand total . . . . .	3,075,000	1,974,000	1,526,000	1,289,000	2,815,000

It will be seen that in all the colonies there is a majority of males; the table appended shows the increase in 9½ years, ending with the last census; the proportion of females to males in each colony; and the density of population.

Colony.	Increase in 9½ years.	Females to every 100 Males.	Persons to the Square Mile.
Victoria... ..	114,934	90·75	9·7
New South Wales ... ..	232,286	82·77	2·4
Queensland ... ..	88,379	72·09	·35
South Australia ... ..	90,847	87·05	·31
Western Australia ... ..	4,355	71·39	·03
Tasmania ... ..	13,920	89·18	4·3
New Zealand ... ..	222,947	81·66	5·1

The numerical increase, therefore, from 1871 to 1881 was more than twice as great in New South Wales, and nearly twice as great in New Zealand, as in Victoria. In proportion to population, the increase was by far the greatest in New Zealand and next in Queensland. The order in which the colonies stand in reference to the proportionate increase in their population during the decade is, New Zealand, with an increase of 83 per cent.; Queensland, 70 per cent.; South Australia, 48 per cent.; New South Wales, nearly 45 per cent.; Western Australia, 17 per cent.; Victoria, 15 per cent.; and lastly, Tasmania, with an increase of 13 per cent. The increase of the whole Australasian population during the period was little short of 39 per cent., at which rate it would double itself in less than twenty-five years. The equality of the sexes in point of numbers is most nearly approached in Victoria, and next in Tasmania. The inequality is greatest in Western Australia and in Queensland. In Victoria the density of popu-

\* The census in 1871 was not taken regularly throughout the colonies; all of them, however, made estimates of population at the end of 1871, and they are the figures given in the above table.

lation is much greater than in any other of the colonies, and is least in Western Australia. On the continent of Australia, taken as a whole, there was at the census only *three-fourths* of a person to the square mile, or about 74 persons to the 100 square miles; in Australasia—that is, including Tasmania and New Zealand—there still was less than one person to the square mile, or about 92 persons to the 100 square miles.

The following table contains a statement of the birthplaces of the people of each Australasian colony, according to the census of 1881:—

*A Table giving the Numbers (in thousands) of the Inhabitants, at the Census of 1881, of each of the Australasian Colonies who were*

Born in	Inhabitants of							Totals of the Various Nationalities.
	Victoria.	New South Wales.	Queensland.	South Australia.	Western Australia.	Tasmania.	New Zealand.	
1. Australasia . .	538	511	120	178	20	82	284	1,743
a. The Colony itself . .	499	467	106	169	20	79	267	1,607
b. The other Colonies .	39	44	14	9	*	3	17	136
2. England & Wales	147	110	37	59	6	17	121	497
3. Scotland . . .	48	25	9	10	*	3	52	147
4. Ireland . . . .	80	68	27	18	2	6	48	255
5. Other British Possessions .	3	3	1	1	*	*	3	11
6. France . . . .	1	1	*	*	*	*	*	2
7. Germany . . .	8	7	11	8	*	*	4	38
8. United States .	2	2	*	*	*	*	*	4
9. China . . . .	11	10	11	4	*	*	5	41
10. Other Countries	6	6	11	2	*	*	8	33
11. Residue . . .	6	2	1	1	*	*	2	12

\* Signifies under one thousand persons.

From the above table it appears that the natives of the Australasian colonies resident therein at the date of the census numbered 1,743,000. About half a million (497,000) of the inhabitants were born in England and Wales, nearly one hundred and fifty thousand (147,000) in Scotland, and over a quarter of a million (255,000) in Ireland. About eleven thousand were natives of other British possessions; very few, two or three thousand, were born in France, and not many more, about five thousand, in the United States. The only foreign nationality that makes any show is the German, with about forty thousand persons; the Chinese, who are chiefly to be found in the eastern colonies, number rather over forty thousand; and the "residue," comprising those born at sea and those of whom the birthplace was not returned, and who

are largely credited to Victoria, amount to about twelve thousand. Taking the whole population of Australia, Tasmania, and New Zealand, as shown by the census in 1881, to be about 2½ millions, it appears that over nine hundred thousand of them were born in the United Kingdom, one and three-quarter millions were born in Australasia, and less than fifty thousand in France, Germany, and the United States together. The figures speak most conclusively as to the purely British character of the population. At a time when the memory of the patriotic offers of assistance to the mother country made by the Australasian and other colonies is still fresh, it is interesting to notice the number of males at the "soldier's age" (twenty to forty years) in the colonies now under consideration. Mr. Hayter (whose most valuable compilation, "The Victorian Year-Book," we are largely indebted to for the figures in the tables already quoted) gives the numbers as being in New South Wales, 131,000; in Victoria, 114,000; in New Zealand, 86,000; in South Australia, 52,000; in Queensland, 46,000; in Tasmania, 15,000; and in Western Australia, 4,000; making a grand total of 450,000. These figures represent the numbers enumerated more than four years ago; probably they now amount to half a million.

From 1871 to 1881 the total population of the British dominions increased from 235 millions to 253 millions. Of this increase 3½ millions took place in the United Kingdom, 11½ millions in India, nearly 900,000 in British North America and the West Indies, 820,000 in Australasia, and 670,000 in Cape Colony (partly from an extension of territory); and a population of 311,000 was added by the acquisition of Cyprus and Fiji. The Australasian colonies occupy three-eighths of the area, and contain nearly a ninetieth of the population of the British Empire. The position of Australasia as a customer of the United Kingdom is seen from the following table, showing that Australasia stands third in the order of the export markets of the United Kingdom, and fifth in the order of the import markets:—

Exports of British home produce to the Principal Foreign Countries and British Possessions.			Imports into the United Kingdom from the Principal Foreign Countries and British Possessions.		
To	1882.	1883.	From	1882.	1883.
	£	£		£	£
British India . .	29,000,000	31,800,000	United States . .	88,300,000	99,200,000
United States . .	80,900,000	27,800,000	British India . .	39,900,000	38,800,000
Australasia . . .	25,800,000	24,200,000	France . . . . .	39,000,000	35,000,000
Germany . . . .	18,500,000	18,700,000	Germany . . . .	25,500,000	27,000,000
France . . . . .	17,400,000	17,500,000	Australasia . . .	25,100,000	25,900,000
Netherlands . .	9,800,000	9,500,000	Netherlands . . .	25,300,000	25,100,000

The universal depression of prices last year caused the totals of the value of the import and export trade to shrink considerably below those for 1883. While the total value of our imports from foreign countries declined by  $10\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. and the total value of our exports to foreign countries by  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent., our colonial trade was much less unfavourably affected, the imports only declining by  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. and the exports by  $2\frac{1}{4}$  per cent.

Trade of the United Kingdom with	Imports.		Exports.	
	1883.	1884.	1883.	1884.
1. Foreign Countries..	£328,000,000 ...	£294,000,000 ...	£215,000,000 ...	£207,600,000
2. British Colonies and Dependencies ...	98,600,000 ...	95,800,000 ...	90,000,000 ...	88,000,000

If there be wisdom in the saying, "happy the country that has no history," Australia may indeed be congratulated on its exceptional felicity. Its history may be summed up in two words, "prodigious prosperity." For the purpose of showing the general economic progress of the continent, and of the island of Tasmania, we have summarized certain of the decennial tables published in "The Australian Year-Book for 1885," with the following result:—

Year.	New South Wales.	Queensland.	South Australia.	Tasmania.	Victoria.	Western Australia.
POPULATION.						
1820 ...	29,000 ...	— ...	— ...	5,400 ...	— ...	—
1850 ...	265,000 ...	— ...	63,000 ...	69,000 ...	76,000 ...	5,800
1880 ...	770,000 ...	226,000 ...	283,000 ...	114,000 ...	860,000 ...	29,000
1883 ...	869,000 ...	287,000 ...	304,000 ...	126,000 ...	931,000 ...	31,000

LAND IN CULTIVATION (ACRES).						
1820 ...	— ...	— ...	— ...	3,178 ...	— ...	—
1850 ...	198,000 ...	— ...	64,000 ...	168,000 ...	52,000 ...	7,000
1880 ...	706,000 ...	120,000 ...	2,500,000 ...	373,000 ...	1,997,000 ...	63,000
1883 ...	789,000 ...	167,000 ...	2,754,000 ...	393,000 ...	2,215,000 ...	61,000

CULTIVATION OF WHEAT (Extent in Acres).						
1850-1.	70,000 ...	— ...	40,000 ...	60,000 ...	20,000 ...	4,000
1880-1.	250,000 ...	10,000 ...	1,730,000 ...	50,000 ...	970,000 ...	27,000
1883-4.	280,000 ...	9,000 ...	1,841,000 ...	40,000 ...	1,100,000 ...	28,000

PRODUCE OF WHEAT IN BUSHELS.						
1850-1.	920,000 ...	— ...	410,000 ...	1,230,000 ...	550,000 ...	30,000
1880-1.	3,700,000 ...	221,000 ...	8,600,000 ...	750,000 ...	9,720,000 ...	190,000
1883-4.	4,340,000 ...	40,000 ...	14,640,000 ...	730,000 ...	15,570,000 ...	370,000

CATTLE.						
1850 ...	1,738,000 ...	— ...	60,000 ...	82,000 ...	378,000 ...	18,000
1880 ...	2,580,000 ...	3,162,000 ...	307,000 ...	127,000 ...	1,286,000 ...	63,000
1883 ...	1,646,000 ...	4,246,000 ...	319,000 ...	180,000 ...	1,297,000 ...	64,000

SHEEP.						
1850 ...	7,396,000 ...	— ...	984,000 ...	1,822,000 ...	6,032,000 ...	128,000
1880 ...	32,399,000 ...	6,935,000 ...	6,463,000 ...	1,783,000 ...	10,360,000 ...	1,231,000
1883 ...	34,418,000 ...	11,507,000 ...	6,677,000 ...	1,831,000 ...	10,739,000 ...	1,315,000

EXTERNAL TRADE: IMPORTS.						
	£	£	£	£	£	£
1850 ...	2,000,000 ...	— ...	800,000 ...	600,000 ...	700,000 ...	50,000
1880 ...	13,900,000 ...	3,000,000 ...	5,500,000 ...	1,800,000 ...	14,500,000 ...	300,000
1883 ...	20,900,000 ...	6,200,000 ...	6,800,000 ...	1,800,000 ...	17,700,000 ...	500,000

Year.	New South Wales.	Queensland.	South Australia.	Tasmania.	Victoria.	Western Australia.
EXTERNAL TRADE: EXPORTS.						
	£	£	£	£	£	£
1850 ...	2,300,000 ...	— ...	500,000 ...	600,000 ...	1,000,000 ...	20,000
1880 ...	15,500,000 ...	3,400,000 ...	5,500,000 ...	1,600,000 ...	15,900,000 ...	400,000
1883 ...	19,800,000 ...	5,200,000 ...	4,800,000 ...	1,700,000 ...	16,300,000 ...	400,000
RAILWAYS (Miles Open).						
1880 ...	849 ...	633 ...	667 ...	172 ...	1,199 ...	72
1883 ...	1,365 ...	1,038 ...	988 ...	167 ...	1,502 ...	115

Population is seen to be increasing "by leaps and bounds" in New South Wales, Queensland, and Victoria. Fresh land is being brought under cultivation by hundreds of thousands of acres each year, the total under cultivation having sprung from 5,760,000 acres in 1880 to 6,380,000 acres in 1883, Western Australia being the only colony to show a diminished acreage. Except in Queensland and Tasmania, there is a steady growth in the quantity of land under wheat, with a more than proportionate increase in the total yield. New South Wales is the only colony that is not increasing the number of its cattle, but, on the other hand, it is considerably increasing the number of its sheep. In Queensland the cattle increased by more than a million, and the sheep by more than four millions, between 1880 and 1883. In every colony the flocks have considerably increased. The total value of the imports and exports exceeds a hundred millions; and the growth in the mileage of railway open—from about 3,600 miles in 1880 to more than 5,200 miles in 1883—cannot but be regarded with satisfaction, if only for the facility afforded to the transport of produce and the development of the country.

The honour of being the first European to behold the Great South Land has been awarded, with some confidence, by Sir Robert Rawlinson to a Provençal navigator, Guillaume le Testu, a native of the city of Grasse. The evidence relied upon is furnished by certain French maps and relative documents found in the British Museum and the War Office of Paris, of dates respectively 1542 and 1555, and from these it would appear that the original discovery was made so early as in the year 1531. Be this as it may, it has been customary until lately to regard the Dutch and the Spaniards as equally entitled to the honour. It appears certain, however, that the yacht *Duyfphen*, fitted out at the instance of the Governor-General of the Dutch East Indies with the object of exploring the southern coast of New Guinea, was the first vessel to discover the northern coast of Australia, along which the Dutch captain sailed under the impression that the peninsula of Cape York was a continuation of the mainland of New Guinea. This voyage is believed to have been made in March, 1606. In the previous year a Spanish

expedition, consisting of three vessels, under the command of Admiral De Quiros, had been despatched from Peru to discover the great southern mainland which was then popularly believed to cover a large portion of the Southern Hemisphere. A tract of land was discovered, and named by De Quiros *Tierra Austral del Espiritu Santo*.\* A storm having separated the ship containing Luiz Vaez de Torres (who held a subordinate command) from the rest of the fleet, he followed a westerly course, and, passing to the southward of New Guinea and northward of the mainland of Australia, thus discovered the straits that have ever since borne his name. During the next forty or fifty years a succession of Dutch navigators discovered the northern and western coasts and a portion of the southern, as well as the island of Van Diemen's Land, the best remembered of whom are, perhaps, Dirk Hartog (1616), Captain Pieter Carpenter (who in 1628 explored the Gulf of Carpentaria and gave it his name), and Abel Janz Tasman. The latter had been commissioned in 1642 by Anthony Van Diemen, the Dutch Governor-General of the Indies, to prosecute geographical discovery on the coasts of Australia, and he was successful in unveiling to European knowledge Van Diemen's Land (supposed to belong to the Australian mainland) and the islands of New Zealand.

Dampier, of buccaneering fame, is believed to have been the first Englishman to visit Australia. Sailing from Virginia in 1688 with the purpose of attacking the Spaniards in the southern seas, he doubled Cape Horn, and, crossing the Pacific, arrived at the north-west coast of the Australian continent. He found the country very sterile, and the natives quite unsuitable subjects as recruits for the labour market of the American and West Indian colonies. After a stay of a couple of months he retired from the country, merely giving his name to a tract of land and to a group of islands off the coast. A hundred years later our world-famous navigator, Captain Cook, accompanied by Sir Joseph Banks, was sent to Tahiti in H.M.S. *Endeavour* to observe the transit of Venus over the sun's disk. Having accomplished his object, and made a survey of New Zealand as well, he continued his course westward in order to explore the eastern coast of "Terra Australis Incognita," or New Holland, as Australia was then usually called. On April 18, 1770, the *Endeavour* was off Cape Howe, the south-eastern extremity of the continent. Sailing along the rock-girt coast in a northerly direction, and

---

\* Some uncertainty appears to exist as to what land this was; probably, however, it was one of the larger islands of the Louisiade group, or perhaps even one of the New Hebrides.

noting its promontories and bays, he named the country New South Wales, from its apparent resemblance to the coast of Wales. The surpassing loveliness of Botany Bay most favourably impressed him; but the hostile attitude of the natives effectually hindered any sojourn on the part of the English vessel. Hurriedly passing the headlands of a passage which he named Port Jackson, after the seaman who had observed it, Cook continued his voyage along the east coast, and finally planted the British flag in the neighbourhood of Cape York. Botany Bay, however, was too lovely to be forgotten. Among other purposes for which it was declared by its discoverers to be suitable, it was recommended to the Ministry as the very place to which to send the surplus felony of these islands.\* The suggestion was adopted; a fleet of eleven vessels was fitted out and sailed from England in May, 1787, under the command of Captain Arthur Phillip, R.N., having on board 1,044 souls—viz., 200 marines and 40 soldiers, in charge of 696 prisoners, 192 of whom were females. Including the wives and children of the military, and 81 free emigrants, chiefly mechanics to instruct the prisoners, there were 348 free people.

On January 18, 1788 the squadron anchored in Botany Bay. In consequence, however, of "the openness of the bay and the dampness of the soil, by which the people would probably be rendered unhealthy," Captain Phillip decided the spot was not suitable for settlement, and, sailing a few miles northwards, he entered the harbour of Port Jackson, and, on January 26, took formal possession of the country in the name of his Majesty George the Third. The commission constituting Captain Phillip Governor comprised the whole extent of the discoveries of Captain Cook (including those of Tasman to the southward) on the Australian continent (from South Cape, Van Diemen's Land, to Cape York), and the adjacent islands (Norfolk Island and New Zealand), in the Pacific Ocean. This vast territory was not intended to form the permanent extent of the colony of NEW SOUTH WALES, but it enabled the Governor to exercise jurisdiction

\* Transportation of criminals was regulated by parliamentary enactment in 1718, owing to the failure of those *who undertook to transport themselves* and the great want of servants in his Majesty's plantations. Thenceforth convicts were to be sent out under the superintendence of contractors who should be bound to prove that they had disposed of them according to the intention of the law. These contractors were empowered to hire the convicts to the planters for longer or shorter periods according to their sentences. Upon the revolt of the American colonies, it was determined to send convicts to the West Coast of Africa, but the mortality amongst those transported to that pestilential region was so terrible that the practice was soon relinquished, and the prisons of England were soon overflowing with convicts.



in any part of it, and to protect the whole from the intrusion of any foreign Power.

Having decided on the suitability of the southern shores of Port Jackson as a site for a settlement, an encampment was formed, and named Sydney, after the then Secretary of State for the Colonies. Before the end of the year, a party was sent by the Governor to Norfolk Island, under the command of Captain Hunter; and Paramatta—then known as Rose Hill—was also occupied at the head of Port Jackson. For a number of years famine threatened the young colony. The loss of a store-ship, the neglect of the home authorities—who were closely engaged in watching continental affairs—and the failure to raise sufficient crops for their own consumption caused severe suffering to the settlers. The Governor, however, was equal to the occasion, and, being firmly imbued with a sense of his duty, he clung to his struggling settlement, and had the satisfaction of handing over to his successor in 1792 the charge of a colony as to the stability of which there was no longer any doubt. For the first thirty or forty years after the founding of the colony, the most important events were the various journeys and voyages of exploration made, or attempted, by means of which the character and resources of the country became gradually known. For nearly ten years after the arrival of “the first fleet,” the island of Tasmania, then called Van Diemen’s Land, was believed to be joined to the Australian continent, and Bass’s Straits were thought to be a deep bay. At length two naval officers, George Bass and Matthew Flinders, the former a surgeon, the latter a midshipman in the Royal Navy, made a determined effort to explore the southern coast. In a small open boat called the *Tom Thumb* they made some important discoveries, and experienced severe hardships in their joint expeditions. Bass, however, in 1798 started alone, in a whaleboat manned by six seamen, and sailed southwards along the coast. Rounding Wilson’s Promontory, the most southerly point of Australia, he entered Western Port on June 4. Owing to the strong current which he encountered, the idea occurred to him of a passage existing between the mainland and Tasmania. Later in the year, accompanied by Flinders, he sailed through the straits and around Tasmania. On their return to Sydney, the Governor decided that the channel separating Tasmania from Australia should be called “Bass’s Straits.” Four years later, Port Phillip Bay was discovered by Lieutenant Murray, R.N., who had been sent from Sydney to survey the south coast. Only three months later, Flinders, then a commander, entered the bay in the *Investigator*. Not being aware that Murray had been there before him, Flinders spent a week in examining the bay, and he gives his impressions in the following words:—

I find it difficult to speak in general terms of Port Phillip. On the one hand it is capable of receiving and sheltering a larger fleet of ships than ever went to sea, whilst, on the other, the entrance in its whole width is scarcely two miles, and nearly half of it is occupied by the rocks lying off Point Nepean and by shoals on the opposite side. . . . No runs of fresh water were met with in my excursions. . . . The country round Port Phillip has a pleasing and in many parts a fertile appearance, and the sides of some of the hills and several of the valleys are fit for agricultural purposes. It is in great matter a grassy country, and capable of supporting much cattle, though better calculated for sheep.\*

In the year following the discovery of Port Phillip an attempt was made, by Governor King's direction, to establish a settlement in the district. Colonel Collins was sent in command of 400 persons—300 of whom were convicts—and landed in the bay in October, 1803, at a spot not far from the present township of Sorrento. Though the site has now become a favourite watering-place, Colonel Collins soon decided against its suitability for a settlement, and, having obtained permission from the Governor, proceeded to the south of Tasmania, and founded Hobart, on the banks of the river Derwent.

In Sydney itself there was considerable social disturbance, due in some degree to the arbitrary conduct of the officers of the New South Wales Corps, who obtained a monopoly of the traffic in rum, and fostered the worst habits of those over whom they were in charge. The question of the civil *status* of the "Emancipists," or those who became free on completing the terms of their legal sentence, also added to the difficulties of administering the government. The convicts themselves in many cases had been transported on political charges, or for offences that would now be punishable by a brief term of imprisonment. Doubtless many were the victims of political faction; and, assuredly, sympathizers with the French revolutionists ran grave risk of a passage to Botany Bay. At first, all the prisoners were employed on public works. Soon, by good behaviour, some of them obtained a "conditional pardon," and received grants of land on which they were expected to maintain themselves, though they were, in times of distress, assisted out of the public stores. There were very few among the early settlers, either free or convict, who understood agriculture; hence the early privations endured by the community. Although it was attempted to mix a certain number of free emigrants with every shipload of prisoners, capitalists rather than labourers were the first actually attracted, owing to the extensive

\* "Voyage to Terra Australis," vol. i. p. 218. By Matthew Flinders, R.N. London. 1814.

grants of land that were offered to induce emigration. To diminish the demands on the public stores of food, it became usual to grant blocks of land to those who would undertake to employ convicts and provide them with food and clothing. By distributing the prison population, exploration was advanced and several stations were established on the coast, as at Newcastle and Port Macquarie, and inland as at Goulburn. The western country, however, was opened up by the energy of the great sheepowners, who, seeking new pastures for their increasing flocks, successfully penetrated the scrub that covered the Blue Mountains. In 1813 the heights were scaled by Messrs. Wentworth, Blaxland, and Lawson, and the rich plains of Bathurst became known as the finest sheepwalks in the world. By that time the quality of the originally imported flocks had been much improved by the efforts of Mr. John Macarthur, who had imported the merino and crossed it with the hairy-woolled sheep then browsing on the colonial pastures. Visiting England in 1804, Mr. Macarthur succeeded in interesting the woollen manufacturers in the Sydney wool; and, Government approving his pastoral schemes, he was encouraged to procure the best specimens of sheep to be had. The result was that the Improved breed thrived amazingly in the genial climate of New South Wales, and wool became the chief source of colonial wealth. A wonderful impulse was given to the pastoral interest by the establishment in 1825 of the Australian Agricultural Company, and in 1830 there were estimated to be 270,000 cattle and 650,000 sheep, while the population was only 46,000. Up to that date it had been the policy and practice of the Imperial Government to promote the "heroic work of colonization," as Bacon called it, in New South Wales by granting land to emigrants, presumably of suitable character and qualification. In 1831, however, the influence of the school of reformers headed by Edward Gibbon Wakefield became powerful enough to secure the establishment of the system of selling the waste lands of the colony by public auction. A minimum price was fixed, and the proceeds of the land-sales were devoted to obtaining a supply of eligible emigrants. At first the minimum price fixed was 5s. an acre, afterwards 12s. an acre, and subsequently, by the Land Sales Act of 1842, £1 an acre. By that Act it was provided that at least one-half of the whole amount accruing from the sales of land in the colony should be appropriated to defraying the cost of the emigration of families and individuals from the United Kingdom.

Until 1842 New South Wales had been ruled despotically by its Governors. By an Imperial Act passed in that year, the colony received a sham Constitution under which a Legislative

Council was established, consisting of thirty-six members, twelve to be nominated by the Crown and twenty-four to be elected by the colonists. This Council had no control over the Governor or the Executive Council. Melbourne, the new settlement at Port Phillip, had the right to send one member to Sydney to sit on the Legislative Council; and, to show their contempt for the Act, the colonists of Melbourne in 1846 unanimously elected as their representative Earl Grey, then the Colonial Secretary. Gradually politicians at home began to realize the facts of the rapid development of the colony and its dependent settlements, and in 1850, by the Australian Colonies Act, political independence was granted to New South Wales, and to Port Phillip and Van Diemen's Land, which were erected into separate colonies. Provision was also made for detaching that portion of New South Wales which lay north of 30° latitude, and erecting this part into a separate colony. Effect was given to this provision in 1859, when the Moreton Bay settlement became the colony of Queensland. Legislative Councils were authorized for each of the new colonies, as well as for South Australia, and all four were empowered to draw up their own Constitutions. New Zealand had already been separated in 1841 from New South Wales. In 1855 the new Constitutions received the royal assent, and responsible government was fully established.\*

Transportation to New South Wales ceased in 1840, and all attempts on the part of the home Government, instigated by certain influential colonists, to revert to the system were repelled by the great body of the colonists with complete success.

Subsequent to the date of the Act (1851) bestowing responsible government on the colonists, a remonstrance was drawn up by a committee of the Legislative Council, and submitted to Earl Grey. One of the principal grievances enumerated was the

\* Section xxvii. appears to have slipped into the Act without any suitable debate taking place as to the effects likely to result from its action. By it power was given to the various colonies to put an import duty upon the produce and manufactures of the mother country; and the fact that section xxxviii. provided that the Act might be amended appears either to have been since forgotten, or regarded as practically impossible to put into operation. Section xxvii. runs as follows: ". . . it shall be lawful for the Governor and Legislative Council of New South Wales," and of the other colonies, ". . . to impose and levy such duties and customs as to such Governors and Councils may seem fit on the importation into such respective colonies of any goods, wares, and merchandise whatsoever, whether the produce or manufacture of, or imported from, the United Kingdom, or any foreign country; provided always that no new duty shall be so imposed upon the importation into any of the said colonies of any article the produce or manufacture of, or imported from, any particular country or place which shall not be equally imposed on the importation in the same colony of the like article the produce or manufacture of, or imported from, all other countries and places whatsoever."

retention of the whole power over the waste lands and land revenue of the colony in the hands of the Imperial Government. Earl Grey's reply in 1852 was to the effect that the waste lands of the colonial possessions of the empire were held by the Crown in trust for the inhabitants of the empire at large, and not for the inhabitants of the particular province in which any such waste lands might be situated. When and on what conditions it might be desirable to transfer the control of the waste lands of the colony to the local Legislature was, in his belief, "a question of expediency and not of right." The committee, however, persevered, and sent a second petition upon the change of Government taking place in the United Kingdom, and what they failed to obtain from Earl Grey they succeeded in getting from Sir John Pakington,\* his successor at the Colonial Office. It being no longer imperative on the local Legislature to appropriate one-half of the revenue from the sales of land to the furtherance of immigration, there was a perceptible decline in the flow of emigrants from the United Kingdom as soon as the rush induced by the discovery of gold had subsided.

The Constitution of New South Wales, as established by the Act of 1855, vests the legislative power in a Parliament of two Houses, the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly. The Council consists of fifty-five members nominated by the Crown, and cannot be reduced below twenty-one members. The first Council was nominated for five years, but members of the subsequent Councils have been appointed for life. The Assembly, under the "Electoral Act of 1880," consists of 113 members, representing seventy-two constituencies; provision is made for giving increased representation to the various electoral districts according to the growth of population. The qualification for election to the Assembly extends to every male subject of her Majesty on his coming of age, provided he is a native of New South Wales or a naturalized subject. There is no property qualification for electors, and votes are taken by ballot. The executive is in the hands of the Governor, nominated by the Crown, and assisted by a Cabinet of nine Ministers. By the terms of his commission, the Governor is commander-in-chief of all the troops in the colony. The naval force is represented by a naval brigade of 328 of all ranks, and a purely volunteer corps, the "N.S.W. Naval Artillery Volunteers," numbering about eighty members. Upon the withdrawal of the Imperial troops in 1870, colonial regulars were raised, consisting of one battery of artillery and two companies of infantry; the latter were disbanded in 1872. In 1876, the artillery was increased by a second battery,

---

\* The late Lord Hampton.

and in 1877 by a third battery, at which establishment it now remains. In the same year a torpedo corps of 100 men was raised and organized.

Education is under the control of the State. The amount expended by the Department of Public Instruction in 1888 was £870,000. There were 2,987 teachers and 155,000 scholars. Special schools increased the totals to 3,023 teachers and 157,000 scholars. The University of Sydney in 1884 had 17 professors and 128 students, with an income exceeding £22,000.

Public revenue in recent years has been largely derived from the sale and rent of public lands, but in 1884 the sales were partially stopped owing to the passing of a new Land Act, which came into operation on January 1, 1885. Customs dues afford the next most important source of revenue, yielding nearly one-fourth of the total annual receipts. The only direct tax is the Stamp tax. The total public debt of the colony is between twenty-four and twenty-five million pounds, and the railways alone have been valued by competent authorities at twenty-five millions. In addition to this realizable asset, a sum of twelve millions is due from the conditional purchasers of Crown lands, producing an annual interest of £310,000, and there remain about 150,000,000 acres of the public estate still unalienated, the yearly rents of which are £360,000, with a prospective increase of £750,000 to be looked for from the action of recent legislation—the freehold value being simply incalculable.

The pastoral resources of New South Wales are not surpassed by those of any country of the same size in the world. The western districts especially abound in vast districts of the richest pasture-land, where the flocks of sheep each number many thousands. The quantity of wool produced in 1883 was greater than in any previous year, and the export of wool amounted to 188,161,700 lbs., valued at £9,598,000. Coal (the best as yet found on the Australian continent) and kerosene are also obtained, as well as silver, tin, copper, iron, and gold. Tobacco and sugar are among the chief agricultural products. Industrial works and manufactories are annually increasing in number, employing as far back as 1882 more than 32,000 hands. The general prosperity of the industrial classes is evidenced by the number of depositors in the Savings Banks, which in 1882 contained £2,600,000 deposited by the working classes of a population not much exceeding 800,000 persons.

Sydney, the capital of the colony, resembles in general appearance a busy and prosperous English city. The chief difference is to be found in the marked absence of poverty. In Sydney and throughout the colony there are no workhouses, nor rates for the relief of the poor; but various means exist for

assisting the helplessly indigent. The present population of Sydney exceeds a quarter of a million; the houses number nearly fifty thousand, and there are 121 miles of streets. The city is well lighted and paved, and is spread over a surface measuring nearly four miles north and south and about three miles east and west. The town hall is one of the handsomest in the world. There is also a museum, art gallery, technological museum, free library, and other institutions of a kindred character. Facilities of locomotion are afforded by the steam tramways, and by the hundreds of cabs and omnibuses plying in every direction. Ferry-boats are continually conveying passengers to and from the extensive suburbs which have sprung up on the northern shore of the harbour and on the Paramatta and Lane Cove rivers, or to the numerous pleasure resorts in the neighbourhood of the city. In the space of little more than two years Sydney will celebrate the hundredth anniversary of its foundation, and the occasion might well be taken by the inhabitants of the other great cities of the empire to commemorate in suitable fashion, not only the foundation of a city destined to be greater than ancient Rome, but the settlement of the mother colony of a dominion that promises to become the home of so many millions of the British race.

We have seen how Colonel Collins somewhat hastily decided in 1803 that Port Phillip was not suitable for the establishment of a settlement. He certainly landed at a very unfavourable spot, and can only be reproached with not having made a more extensive survey of the neighbourhood. Had he done so he must have discovered a location suitable for his purpose, and the colonization of Port Phillip district would have been hastened by some thirty years. As it was, for twenty years after Collins's hurried visit the district was almost forgotten. In 1824, however, the explorers Hamilton Hume and Hovell travelled overland from Sydney to Port Phillip, and on their return to Sydney gave so favourable reports of the soil and the adaptability of the country for colonization that again an attempt was made to establish a convict settlement. Again a landing was effected upon a most unsuitable spot, and a speedy withdrawal followed. The next attempt was carefully planned, and met with deserved success. Mr. Edward Henty, a merchant of Launceston, Van Diemen's Land, examined the locality in the neighbourhood of Portland Bay, and decided to remove thither; and in November, 1834, he crossed Bass's Straits with a few followers, and commenced to till the soil, to run and breed stock, and to carry on whaling operations. The barrenness of the ground, however, compelled a search for more propitious pastures, and rich country was soon found in the interior. Large pastoral establishments

were formed, fresh settlers arrived, in a few years several fortunes had been made, and the colonization of Port Phillip district as a dependency of New South Wales was effected. The foundation of Melbourne soon followed the successful settlement by Henty. In 1835 two parties from Van Diemen's Land crossed Bass's Straits. The first was under the leadership of John Batman, who acted on behalf of an association of Government officers and professional men resident in the island. The other expedition was largely due to the initiative of John Pascoe Fawkner, an innkeeper at Launceston. A schooner named the *Enterprise* "was freighted with stores, farming implements, grain, seeds, plants, fruit trees, three horses, and other requisites," and was despatched to Port Phillip Bay. Proceeding to the head of the bay, the *Enterprise* sailed up the Yarra Yarra river, and on August 28, 1835—just fifty years ago—was "made fast to trees opposite the spot on which Melbourne now stands." \*

In 1836, Major Mitchell, the Surveyor-General of New South Wales, explored the country in the direction of Port Phillip till he arrived at Portland Bay. He passed through some of the best parts of the country, to which he gave the name of "Australia Felix," and his accounts of the richness and capabilities of the soil led to a very considerable influx of settlers from both Sydney and Van Diemen's Land. Herds of cattle and flocks of sheep were driven overland from New South Wales, and found ample pasture-lands in the new territory. Numerous emigrants with their stock arrived from Van Diemen's Land, and ship-loads of people from the mother country soon swelled the population of the district. A resident magistrate (Captain Lonsdale) was appointed by the Governor, and he at once decided upon the spot first fixed upon by Fawkner's party as the suitable site of the future metropolis. His choice was approved by the Governor, Sir R. Bourke, who arrived on a visit from Sydney in March, 1837, and the rapidly rising town was named after Lord Melbourne, then Prime Minister. Within three years the population of Port Phillip numbered nearly 6,000, with half a million sheep and very large herds of cattle. Altogether the place was growing so important that the home Government decided to send out a superintendent, and Mr. C. J. La Trobe was appointed to the office, with instructions to act under the Governor of New South Wales. About this time the inhabitants of the new community became affected by a mania for speculation. Industry was neglected, the necessaries of life became exorbitantly high, and the inevitable crash followed in 1842. In a short time the value



of landed property and stock became almost nominal. To show the depth of the depression, we may mention that the practice of boiling down sheep for tallow was introduced, and—as each sheep thus acquired a value of nine shillings (instead of being worth nothing)—for a time proved a real boon to the pastoral settlers.\*

As the depression passed away and the condition of the community improved, an agitation for separation from the parent colony began to assume shape. Melbourne was distant from Sydney about 570 miles, and the colonists of Port Phillip urged that their interests suffered in consequence. After several years of agitation, the Imperial Act of 1850, “for the better government of the Australian colonies,” provided for the separation of Port Phillip district from New South Wales and its erection into a separate colony to be called Victoria. On July 1, 1851—a day which has since been scrupulously observed as a public holiday—VICTORIA was proclaimed an independent colony.† In a little more than a month it became known that rich deposits of gold had been found within the colony. Early in the year gold had been discovered in New South Wales, but the Victorian deposits were far richer and extended over a wider area. The rush to the gold-fields must still be fresh in the memory of many who witnessed the exodus of the would-be diggers from Europe and America; and, in the course of a few months after being called into existence as an independent colony, Victoria received an accession of population that placed her ahead of her sister colonies—a position she still retains, but is rapidly forfeiting to New South Wales. The somewhat harsh manner in which the licences to dig for gold were collected by armed troopers, who surrounded parties of diggers whilst at their work, and took into custody all who were without licences, combined with the injustice which forbade the miners (who were often disappointed in their search for gold) from cultivating even a small portion of land on which to maintain themselves and families, gave occasion for a widespread feeling of discontent. A riot taking place at the Eureka workings on the Ballarat fields, and several lives being lost, led to a Royal Commission being appointed by the Governor to inquire into the grievances of the gold-miners, and the oppressive licence fee was removed. Other concessions were made, and the mining population became, and have ever since remained, as loyal as the rest of the colonists.

---

\* In 1850 the export of wool was 18,000,000 lbs., of tallow 10,000,000.

† The portion cut off from New South Wales to form Victoria comprised the southern part of the mother colony and the south-eastern part of the continent. Its extreme length from the Pacific Ocean on the east to the boundary of South Australia on the west is about 490 miles, and its greatest breadth is about 300 miles.

For the last thirty years Victoria has made very satisfactory progress, and now occupies the chief position as a manufacturing colony in the Australasian group. At the close of 1883 gold to the value of £209,000,000 had been raised. Her manufactories and works numbered over 2,600 and employed 45,000 people, and the capital invested, so far as it is represented by the value of lands, buildings, machinery, and plant, amounted to £8,500,000.

Melbourne is the most populous city in Australasia, having in 1884, with its suburbs, an estimated population of 304,000. The natural beauties of Sydney are worth a voyage to Australia to witness, but it is in Melbourne, the situation of which has little beauty to recommend it, that Australian trade and capital, business and pleasure, are chiefly found. The size of the buildings and the width of the streets compare favourably with those of Sydney. In neither metropolis is there any evidence of poverty to be seen at all resembling the lower parts of a European city. The Chinese quarter is the nearest approach, but it is peculiar to itself, and there is no trace of squalor. Next to Melbourne, in Victoria, come Ballarat with 41,000, and Sandhurst with 40,000 inhabitants, both being towns of imposing appearance, and vying with the capital in the grandeur of their public and private edifices.

The climate of Victoria generally is far more genial to Europeans than that of any other colony on the continent; it is, however, hotter and drier than in New Zealand or Tasmania.

The Governor of Victoria is appointed by the Crown, and is aided in the conduct of public affairs by a responsible Ministry. There is a Legislative Council composed of forty-two members elected for fourteen provinces, and an Assembly of eighty-six members returned by fifty-five electoral districts. The tenure of seats in the Council is six years, and the Council cannot be dissolved by the Governor. The ordinary duration of the Assembly is three years, but it may be dissolved by the Governor at any time. All members of the Assembly except those who are in receipt of official salary out of the Consolidated Revenue, are paid £300 a year "for reimbursing their expenses in relation to their attendances in Parliament." The members of the Legislative Council are not paid.

The public debt of Victoria at the end of June, 1884, amounted to £28,300,000, of which the greater part had been expended in the construction of railways, and the remainder on the improvement of the water-supply, the enlargement of the docks, and other public works. The chief exports in 1883 were wool and gold (coin and bullion), valued at £6,050,000 and £3,900,000 respectively. According to official estimates, the annual value of

the agricultural produce of Victoria is about £7,000,000, and the annual value of the pastoral produce is nearly £10,000,000. It only remains to Victoria to remove the grave obstacles to industry afforded by her protective tariff to ensure for herself a fresh and, we hope, a permanent source of prosperity.

SOUTH AUSTRALIA is not happily named. A large portion of Victoria lies considerably south of its most southern point, and, since the addition of the northern territory to the colony proper, its name has become positively absurd. Occupying the whole of the centre of the continent from the Southern to the Indian Ocean, with a width of more than 600 miles and a length of 1,200 miles, South Australia is immediately contiguous to each of the other colonies on the mainland; "Central Australia" would better define its position both geographically and in respect to the other colonies.

Flinders was the first to survey the southern coast of the colony; and Sturt, one of the most famous of the great Australian explorers, first visited the interior of the country and announced its fitness for occupation by European settlers. Sturt's account, being corroborated by Captain Barker, excited great interest in England, and in 1831 a movement was set on foot for founding a colony on the coast explored by Flinders thirty years before. It was decided that the colony should be independent of New South Wales from the outset, and should start with a better land system than had been tried over the rest of the continent. Western Australia, then known as the Swan River Settlement, afforded an example of land legislation carefully to be avoided. In that colony immense blocks of land had been granted to settlers without regard to their means of occupying such holdings, and the necessity of obtaining payment for the public lands thus alienated had been completely disregarded by the Government. As an immediate result, the settlers were without the labour required to cultivate their large estates, which in many cases lay waste for a very long period, or at best supported only a few sheep or cattle.

Edward Gibbon Wakefield may justly be regarded as the founder of South Australia, for the scheme on which the colony was built up was based entirely on his theories as to a land system applicable to the circumstances of a colony commencing its career. Wakefield was opposed to grants of land. He considered it should be sold at a substantial price, and that the purchase-money should be expended in importing labourers to till the soil and develop its resources. In South Australia the scheme worked well when once it was fairly started. For the first two or three years, however, after the establishment of the colony in 1836 scarcely any progress was made, owing to delays in the

surveys of the country lands, official mismanagement, and the unwise policy which allowed the settlers to remain in Adelaide—as the infant town was named—instead of advancing into the interior and opening up cultivation. In the autumn of 1839, however, sufficient land to satisfy the original purchasers had been surveyed, over 250,000 acres had been sold for nearly £230,000; and 7,412 settlers had arrived in the colony. In the previous year the first of the “overlanders,” Messrs. Hawden and Bonney, had brought cattle into the colony from New South Wales, by the Murray route,\* and were, shortly afterwards, followed by Mr. Eyre,† also in charge of a herd. In 1839 both sheep and cattle were imported overland. Owing, however, to the policy of Colonel Gawler, who employed the labourers in building public works instead of allowing them to engage in the cultivation of the soil beyond the city bounds, the colony became overwhelmed with debt, and a financial crisis ensued. Property fell in value, privation was universal, but the fortitude of the colonists sustained them, and induced a general move in the direction of agriculture. In the summer of 1841–42, there was an abundant harvest, and two years later wheat was 2s. 6d. per bushel. The discovery, in 1842, of the Kapunda copper-mines, quickly followed by that of the Burra Burra mines, further added to the prosperity of the colony.

Late in 1851 a general exodus of the male population of South Australia to the Victoria gold-diggings took place; the diggers were generally fortunate, and during 1852 and 1853 most of them returned to South Australia, and invested the money obtained from their gold-digging in farming land and farm stock. Agriculture made immense strides while the rush to the diggings continued, hay selling for £10 a ton in Adelaide and £40 in Melbourne, and flour rising to £50 and £60 in South Australia. The flood of prosperity naturally led to much extravagance, but the beneficent effects in the main were enduring, and, though there have since been periods of depression, there has been no serious check to the growing prosperity of the colony.

The principal agricultural and mineral districts are contiguous to the two gulfs,‡ which indent the southern coast for a distance of nearly 800 miles. About two-thirds of the total area of land under cultivation is cropped with wheat, the area under wheat having increased more than a hundred per cent. during the last

---

\* Discovered by Captain Sturt in 1830.

† Afterwards famous for his exploration of the south coast of Western Australia, and in after-years Governor of Jamaica.

‡ St. Vincent's Gulf, running inland for 85 miles; and Spencer's Gulf, which runs inland for 180 miles. These gulfs are separated by Yorke's Peninsula, 120 miles long and 20 miles broad.

ten years. Vine culture is an important and progressive industry, the produce of 3,280 acres having yielded, in 1883, 358,000 gallons of wine—about 130 gallons an acre. The introduction of flax-growing has been attended by considerable success, the prices realized in the European markets having greatly encouraged the growers. Though South Australia is the chief agricultural colony, pastoral pursuits are by no means unimportant, a fact amply testified to by the number of horses, cattle, and sheep owned in the colony.

A simple and inexpensive method of dealing with real estate is afforded by the Real Property Act of South Australia, by means of which the transfer of landed property may be accomplished in as cheap and easy a manner as any ordinary commercial transaction. The total value of lands brought under the operation of this statute to the end of 1883 amounted to nearly £14,000,000.

The South Australian Parliament consists of a Legislative Council of twenty-four members elected by ballot, and a House of Assembly of fifty-two members elected by twenty-six electoral districts. The House is liable to be dissolved by the Governor, but its duration usually extends to three years. The Governor, who is appointed by the Crown, is aided by a Cabinet of six members of the Legislature.

A very brief mention must suffice for the northern territory of South Australia. As an agricultural country, for tropical products especially, the territory offers great attractions. Cinchona, coffee, and cotton will probably soon be exported in considerable quantities. Horses, also, can be reared in the greater part of the territory, though sheep deteriorate. Port Darwin, connected with Adelaide (the capital of the colony, and the third most populous city in Australia) by telegraph, is bound from its very important position to attain a prosperity at present quite unknown.

QUEENSLAND comprises the whole of the north-eastern portion of Australia, and was detached from New South Wales in 1859. Starting from Point Danger, about 400 miles north of Sydney, the seaboard of Queensland extends for a distance of 2,500 miles until it joins the coast line of the northern territory of South Australia in longitude 138° E. Brisbane, the capital of the colony, was discovered and named by Surveyor-General Oxley in 1823. Two years later some of the most unmanageable of the convicts were sent from Sydney; and Moreton Bay—as the settlement on the Brisbane river was called—continued for fourteen or fifteen years to receive a supply of “enforced settlers” from the mother colony. In consequence, however, of the occupation of the Darling Downs in 1841 by the Messrs. Leslie, and the rush of squatters who followed to the newly discovered pasturelands, the convicts were withdrawn in 1842, and Moreton Bay

was proclaimed a free settlement, and immigrants began to arrive and take up "runs." Pastoral pursuits brought a certain amount of prosperity to the settlement, but it was not until 1859 that the district was proclaimed an independent colony under its present name. Agriculture is admitted to be in its infancy, owing to the attention of the colonists being occupied with the more remunerative pursuits of grazing and mining. The importance of the pastoral and mining interests is shown by the value of the chief exports in 1883, which were:—wool, £2,277,000; horses, cattle, and sheep, £626,000; tallow, £179,000; hides and skins, £136,000; gold, £698,000; and tin, £298,000. Valuable timber of various descriptions abounds in Queensland, and promises to become an important export. Excellent coal has been found in different localities. Brisbane, the capital, is being rivalled by Townsville in prosperity, and at the present moment there appears to be every prospect of the northern portion of the colony obtaining its separation from the southern or Brisbane territory.

The Governor is nominated by the Crown, and aided by an Executive Council of responsible Ministers. There is a Legislative Council of thirty-four members, nominated by the Governor, and an Assembly composed of fifty-five members elected by the suffrages of the male colonists who have attained manhood and have resided in the same locality for six months.

A Western Australian once told Sir Frederick Weld, when Governor of the colony, that "when the world was made, all the siftings [meaning the sand] were thrown together to make WESTERN AUSTRALIA." This statement is apt to convey an unfair picture of the colony. A very large part of the surface is sandy, but the sand only needs a sprinkling of water and it will grow all kinds of semi-tropical produce. About 750,000 square miles are still unoccupied and in great part unexplored. In the early days of the colony some 2,700 square miles of the best land along the coast were sold or granted away. Of land still owned by the Colony 250,000 square miles have been leased for cattle and sheep runs. The chief industry—in common with the rest of Australia—is wool-growing. There are at present in the colony, 1,500,000 sheep, 70,000 cattle, and 35,000 horses. When we consider that the total population barely exceeds 32,000, it is evident that Western Australia is not so far behind her sister colonies in wealth and prosperity as is usually imagined. It is still a Crown colony, and the government is administered by a Governor assisted by an Executive Council. There is also a Legislative Council of twenty-four members, four of whom are official, four nominated, and sixteen elected by thirteen electoral districts.

The climate and soil are eminently suitable for the growth of grapes and garden produce. An excellent wine is now made in the best vineyards, and the colony has undoubtedly a future before it as a wine-producing country. The great hindrance to the development of a large portion of the colony is the scarcity of water. Boring, however, has been energetically started, and there is every prospect of irrigation works being undertaken and proving a success. The coast-line, from Eucla in the south to Cambridge Gulf in the north, may be regarded as settled for from 50 to 200 miles inland. The first settlement was made in 1826, on St. George's Sound, at a spot on which the town of Albany now stands. A report that the French contemplated landing on the coast led the Governor of New South Wales to send there a small party of convicts. Three years later a private colony was established on the Swan river, and in the same year (1829) Captain Fremantle took possession of the country for the Crown.

Perth, the capital city, now containing 6,000 inhabitants, and Fremantle, the chief port, with 5,000, were both founded in that year. Albany, the original settlement, contains only 1,200 inhabitants. Its situation on the magnificent harbour of King George's Sound, combined with its excellent position as the first place of call by the P. and O. steamers on the outward and the last on the homeward voyage, needs but the completion of the promised railway from Perth to advance materially its prosperity.

Telegraphic communication extends over 3,000 miles. It is also projected to connect Australia with Singapore or Ceylon by a submarine cable from Roeburne on the north-west coast. The only railway at present consists of a line of 112 miles in length from Fremantle to Perth and on to Guildford, York, and Beverley, the centres of the agricultural districts. It is proposed to extend the railway to Albany, a further distance of 220 miles.

The climate has many charms. It is undoubtedly one of the healthiest in the world. In summer, the heat, though great in the northern districts, is rendered endurable by the light, clear air. The winters are very mild. The forests, principally situate in the south-west, form an important part of the resources of the colony. There is a considerable export of timber, the trade being principally in jarrah and sandalwood. In minerals the colony cannot boast the wealth of her more favoured sisters, but, though gold is found only in small quantities, silver, lead, copper, and iron mines are profitably worked. Western Australia undoubtedly has its drawbacks, but they are gradually being counterbalanced, and its vast territory and varied resources are becoming better known, and need only to be developed by private enterprise and the energetic prosecution of public works

to enable the colony to claim its independence and take its place on terms of equality among the rest of the Australasian colonies.

The island of TASMANIA,\* separated from Australia by Bass's Straits, 120 miles wide, possesses one of the most temperate climates in the world. Offering numerous advantages and attractions to men with limited means, it has become the chosen home of many Anglo-Indians. Believed originally to be a part of the mainland, the island was included within the jurisdiction of the first Governor of New South Wales; possession, however, was not taken until 1803. Occupation followed in 1804, when Colonel Collins arrived in charge of a party of convicts, and founded Hobart Town on the river Derwent, and for fifty years the colony was chiefly regarded as a penal settlement. For many years there was constant warfare between the lawless settlers and the natives, resulting, as usual, in the extinction of the aboriginal inhabitants. Formerly supplying Western Australia, South Australia, and Victoria with wheat, flour, potatoes, and other food-stuffs, Tasmania has suffered in her trade by those colonies becoming self-sustaining. Now her principal exports are wool, tin, gold, fruit and jam, timber, grain, and live stock; Tasmanian hops, however, are finding a capital market in England, and will probably soon figure much more largely in the exports from the island. Both coal and iron mines are awaiting the introduction of capital, and an energetic direction of the workings, to become a source of considerable wealth. Railway communication with the mining districts is much needed. The colony owns nearly 400 miles of railway—about one-third of the whole mileage being used in connecting Hobart with Launceston. The former is the capital of the colony, with 30,000 inhabitants, and Launceston, containing 17,000 inhabitants, is the second city, and is rapidly rising in importance.

The Governor is nominated by the Crown, and is assisted by a responsible Cabinet; the Parliament consists of a Legislative Council of sixteen members, who sit for six years from the date of their election, and a House of Assembly numbering thirty-two members. The duration of the Assembly is five years.

The colony of NEW ZEALAND is one of the most interesting and flourishing in the British dominions. It consists of three islands and several islets lying in the Pacific Ocean, and is distant about 1,200 miles from the nearest point of the Australian continent, 6,000 miles from San Francisco, and 13,000 miles from London. The total area is 104,408 square miles, being about one-sixth less than that of the United

---

\* Known as Van Diemen's Land until 1855, when it was proclaimed an independent colony under its present designation.

[Vol. CXXIV. No. CCXLVIII.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LXVIII. No. II. F F



Kingdom. The North Island is 500 miles in length, and varies from 6 to 300 miles in breadth. The Middle, or, as it is sometimes called, South, Island is more compact in shape; it is 550 miles in length with an average breadth of 120. Stewart Island, lying to the south of Middle Island, from which it is separated by Foveaux Strait, is about 1,000 square miles in extent. North and Middle Islands are separated by Cook Strait, some twelve or thirteen miles across in its narrowest part, but widening considerably towards the north. The coast-line is over 3,000 miles in length and is indented by numerous good harbours. Its maritime position is a remarkable characteristic of the colony, and has proved an important element in its rapid development.

New Zealand is very mountainous, but it also has extensive plains. In the North Island the mountains are mostly covered with thick forest, while in the South Island they are mostly open and well-grassed, and are used for pasture. In the North Island there are volcanic mountains, some few being occasionally active; the height of the ranges varies from 1,500 to 9,000 feet; in the South Island, however, the Southern Alps, running along the west coast throughout its length, rise to a much greater height, Mount Cook being 12,349 feet high. Rivers abound throughout the colony. From the foregoing brief description it will be understood that the country has a great variety of climate. That it is generally healthy and suited to the European constitution can best be seen by reference to the vital statistics, which show that the death-rate is about twelve per thousand.

Discovered and named by the Dutch navigator, Tasman, in 1642, New Zealand is believed to have been unvisited by Europeans until the arrival of Captain Cook in 1769. The Maoris, its aboriginal inhabitants, were at that time cannibals. Captain Cook

planted in the country the first germ of colonization. He successfully introduced the pig and the potato. For thirty-seven years after his last departure, in 1777, from New Zealand, it was only known to the civilized world for the danger of its coasts and the ferocity of its inhabitants. The first European residents there came in 1814 to the Bay of Islands, almost the northern extremity of the North Island, as representatives of the English Church Missionary Society. From that time, for several years, there was an irregular influx of traders, whalers, runaway sailors, and adventurers. The state of the country at that time became worse than it was before. Anarchy and moral contamination created a pandemonium.\*

---

\* "Official Handbook of New Zealand," Part iii. p. 1. By William Gisborne. (Edited by the Agent-General.) London: Edward Stanford. 1884.

The British Government was forced to interfere, and a magistrate was appointed, only to find himself impotent and useless. A scare seized the home authorities lest France should occupy the islands and establish on them a penal settlement: thereupon action was taken by the British Government, and a treaty was negotiated with various native chiefs for a cession of their so-called sovereignty, and, on the conclusion of the Treaty of Waitangi, complete possession of New Zealand was assumed by the Crown in 1840.

The chiefs who signed, ceded their rights and powers of sovereignty to the Queen of England; and her Majesty confirmed and guaranteed to the natives full and exclusive possession of their lands so long as they wished to retain them. The chiefs also yielded to her Majesty the exclusive right of pre-emption over such lands as the proprietors wished to dispose of, at such price in each case as should be mutually agreed upon. . . . The exclusive right of pre-emption by the Crown has been waived by statute, but no land has been taken from the natives without the consent of the owners, except in the special case of confiscated lands, which were taken under the authority of exceptional laws passed in the time of native insurrection. . . . There have been no waste lands of the Crown in the sense in which the term is used in Australia—namely, as belonging to the Crown by right.\*

The colonization of the country was exceptional, and was conducted in a manner quite unlike that adopted in the case of the other Australasian colonies. There were from the commencement various unconnected centres of settlement. On the north-eastern coast of the North Island, Auckland was established by the first Governor, Captain Hobson, R.N., in 1840. In the same year, Wellington was founded in the southern extremity of the same island by the New Zealand Company, an English association formed with the object of systematic colonization. In the following year the same company founded two other settlements—New Plymouth, on the west coast of the North Island, and Nelson, in the north of South, or Middle, Island. Otago, in the southern part of the South Island, was founded by a Scotch association, in 1848, working in connection with the New Zealand Company; and in 1850 Canterbury, in the central part of the east coast of the South Island, was founded by a Church of England association, similarly working. Each settlement had its distinct foundation, and differed from the others in essential features. Communication between them was infrequent and irregular; overland intercourse was almost impracticable; and the few coasting vessels were sailing ships of small tonnage.

For several years the new settlements were governed as Crown

---

\* "Official Handbook of New Zealand," part iii. p. 2.

colonies. In 1853, however, a Constitution framed and granted by the Imperial Parliament in the previous year came into force. That Constitution was based on the popular principle, and was as free as any in the British dominions. The Governor, a nominee Legislative Council, and a House of Representatives constituted the Legislature. The colony was divided into six provinces, each of which had an elective superintendent and an elective Provincial Council. In 1875, however, a colonial Act was passed abolishing the whole provincial system, and in the next year an Act was passed making provision for the division of the colony into counties, and for machinery for their local self-government. At the present time the Governor is assisted by an Executive Council composed of the responsible Ministers of the colony for the time being; the Legislative Council—who are nominated for life—number forty-six, including two Maori members; and the House of Representatives—numbering ninety-five members (including four Maoris)—are elected for three years. Practically, manhood suffrage prevails, as every adult male of sane mind and not in gaol—provided he has resided one year in the colony and six months in one electoral district—can be registered as an elector.

For the maintenance of the protection of person and property, the militia force, consisting of the adult male population, is liable to be called out on active service. There is also a volunteer force existing in the different parts of the colony, and numbering (March 31, 1883) 4,212. Volunteer cadets increased the force by 1,491. There is also a regular force of constabulary, divided into two branches—the police consisting of 460 men, stationed in both islands, and the field force, formed on the model of the Irish Constabulary, numbering 634, and stationed in the North Island, where the bulk of the Maori population are resident. There have been two Maori wars: the first lasted from 1845 to 1848; the second, from 1860 with little intermission until 1870. Fully half the clans, however, have always been favourable to the colonists, and many of them have actually fought against their own countrymen. Permanent tranquillity has existed since 1871, although there was an agitation in 1881 that threatened to develop into disturbance.

The material resources of New Zealand are both varied and of great value. The following extracts from the New Zealand "Crown Lands Guide" of January, 1884, published by the authority of the Minister of Lands, give valuable general information as to the chief resources of the colony:—

The indigenous forest of New Zealand is evergreen, and contains a large variety of valuable woods. Amongst the smaller plants the *Phormium tenax*, or New Zealand flax, is of special value; whilst

large tracts of country are covered with nutritious indigenous grasses, which support millions of sheep. . . . Many of the more valuable trees of Europe, America, and Australia have been introduced, and now flourish with a vigour scarcely ever attained in their natural habitats. In many parts of the colony the hop grows with unexampled luxuriance. . . . Fruit is abundant all over New Zealand. . . . Roots and vegetables of all kinds grow luxuriantly. . . . By the proper selection of soil, and with a system of agriculture modified to suit the great variety of climate . . . every variety of cereal and root crop may be successfully raised in New Zealand, and, with due care in these respects, New Zealand will not fail to become a great producing and exporting country of all the chief food staples. The progress made in agriculture has been very rapid, and the number of persons engaged in this pursuit is, as compared with other countries, very large, more than one in every five of the adult male population being in this way possessed of a permanent stake in the country. . . . The number of holdings of one acre and upwards of cultivated land (exclusive of gardens attached to residences, and native holdings) enumerated in March, 1878, was 20,519 [in 1884 the number had risen to 28,587]. The exports of agricultural and farm produce increased from £262,930 in 1875 to £1,140,239 in 1882. . . . The extent of land under wheat in the early part of 1883 was 390,000 acres; the aggregate produce of the wheat crop was estimated at 2,270,000 bushels, an average of 26·28 bushels per acre. . . . The estimated average yield of other produce for the same year was, for the whole colony: oats, 32·89 bushels per acre; barley, 26·19 bushels per acre; and potatoes, 5·10 tons per acre. . . . The extent to which pastoral pursuits have been followed may be estimated by the quantity of stock in the colony in 1881 (when the last census was taken). The numbers were: horses, 161,736; cattle, 698,637; and sheep, 12,985,085 (and the sheep had increased on May 31, 1884, to 13,306,000).\*

The colony also possesses 200,000 pigs and 1,563,000 head of poultry. Wool is by far the most important production, its value in export approaching nearly four times that of gold, and amounting in 1883 to £3,452,011, while the value of the gold exported in 1883 was £892,000. The value of gold exported in the year ending March 31, 1884, was £959,000, making a total value exported from the colony up to that date of over £40,000,000. The bulk of the gold-mining is on Government lands, and needs a considerable investment of capital properly to be developed. Coal is being raised in increasing quantities each year, but still figures as an import into the colony. Biscuits, breweries, bootmaking, leather, soap, and woollen manufacture are established industries; and at the dairy factories a large quantity of cheese is made.

---

\* "Official Handbook of New Zealand," part iii. pp. 3, 4, 5.

The construction of a comprehensive system of railways connecting the chief towns of the colony was commenced, at the expense of the Government in 1872. On December 31, 1883, there were in all 1,486 miles open for traffic. For the year ending March 31, 1884, the surplus receipts were £305,314. Telegraph lines to the extent of 4,074 miles were in working order at the beginning of 1884; the total number of telegrams despatched during 1883 was 1,599,000, the receipts amounting to £81,401.

The following table shows the growth of the population during the last twenty-five years, and the countries in which they were born :—

Where Born.	Population in 1861.	Population in 1871.	Population in 1881.
I. New Zealand... ..	27,604	93,474	223,404
II. Australia and Tasmania ...	2,579	12,426	17,277
III. England and Wales ...	36,600	68,389	121,187
IV. Scotland... ..	15,534	36,871	52,753
V. Ireland ... ..	8,831	29,733	49,863
VI. Foreign Countries... ..	2,657	10,075	19,777
VII. Residue ... ..	5,216	5,425	6,172
Total... ..	99,021	256,393	489,933

The Maoris, whose numbers are decreasing, are not included in the above figures. The "residue" is chiefly made up of persons born in other British dominions, at sea, and whose birthplaces were not specified. With a population of less than a hundred thousand (99,021) in 1861, New Zealand contained at the census of 1881, 489,933 persons, of whom 269,605 were males and 220,328 females. On June 30, 1884, the population was estimated at 556,000, showing an increase exceeding that of either of the Australian colonies. The density of population is about four persons to the mile; and the people are more evenly divided amongst the chief cities and towns than is the case on the continent of Australia. Dunedin has a population, with its suburbs, of about 45,000; Christchurch and suburbs, 33,000; Wellington (the capital, chosen, from its central position, when the government was removed from Auckland) and suburbs, about 22,000; Auckland and suburbs, 33,000; while Nelson, Napier, Invercargill, and Oamaru have populations approaching 10,000. There is no State Church; and the State system of education is secular and free. Socially and politically, New Zealand is essentially a *British colony*, and offers, in its numerous advantages of climate, soil, settled government, and the general character of its inhabitants, inducements not to be equalled in the case of any other colony.

Until quite recently, Australia was chiefly known to the majority of the inhabitants of the rest of the empire as a gold-

producing country and the home of countless flocks and herds. The spontaneous action of the colonies, however, in offering to the British Government assistance in men and money during the war in the Soudan, aroused a genuine sympathy throughout the mother-country and electrified the empire. For the first time in our imperial history, a distant colony sent at its own cost, and completely equipped, a contingent of troops, who had volunteered with an enthusiasm that could not have been excelled had their services been needed to defend their native shores. It was the "one touch of nature" that made all Englishmen appreciate their kindred. More than anything, the conduct of New South Wales—in common with the other Australasian and Canadian colonies—demonstrated the essential unity of the empire. It remains to our statesmen both at home and in the colonies to cement the union; and the problem is second to none in its concern to our imperial welfare.

---

ART. V.—THE FIFTH DUKE OF LEEDS.

1. *The Political Memoranda of Francis, fifth Duke of Leeds, now first printed from Originals in the British Museum.\** Edited, together with other Papers, and with Notes, Introduction, and Appendix, by OSCAR BROWNING, M.A., Senior Fellow of King's College, Cambridge; University Lecturer in History, and Examiner in the University of London. Printed for the Camden Society. 1884.
2. *The Bland Burges Papers*: Selections from the Letters and Correspondence of Sir James Bland Burges, Baronet, sometime Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. With Notices of his Life. Edited by JAMES HUTTON, Author of "James and Philip Van Arteveldt," &c. London: John Murray. 1885.

OF the "Leeds Memoranda" the editor truly says, "If they reveal to us no very important secrets, nor make it necessary that we should rewrite many pages of our history, they at least enable us to live in the very centre of that aristocratic régime which placed England after 1815 at the head of Europe, and which the modern democracy will find it difficult to surpass." †

Our assent to the truth of the editor's description of his

\* British Museum Additional MSS. 27,918.

† "Leeds Memoranda," Introduction, p. xi.

book must not, however, be taken as extending to his encomium of the old aristocratic *régime*.

We call our readers' attention to these papers the more fully because they are printed "For the Camden Society," and not published for general circulation, and therefore may be, and remain, unknown to the world at large, except to those who may have seen the few extracts given in Mr. Percy Fitzgerald's "Life of George IV."

The authors of the "Leeds Memoranda" and of the "Bland Burges Papers" were closely connected. The Duke was the baronet's senior by only one year. In early life they became acquainted with each other, and with William Pitt. The baronet, as the Duke's nominee, sat in the House of Commons for the borough of Helston. During the Duke's tenure of office as Foreign Secretary he made the baronet his Parliamentary Under-Secretary. The Duke quitted office in 1791, but his Under-Secretary, with the Duke's consent, remained at the Foreign Office until 1795, when he was removed *multa gemens* by a job or intrigue of Lord Grenville. Sir James's public career, therefore, ended shortly after that of his patron, but his natural life exceeded that of the Duke's by a quarter of a century, the Duke dying in 1799, while the baronet survived until 1824.\* The "Bland Burges Papers" are a supplement or complement to the "Leeds Memoranda." There is this distinction between them—the Duke's memoranda were "written down for the most part day by day immediately after the events to which they allude,"† but Sir James did not "commit his recollections to paper" until more than twenty years after he had finally left the Foreign Office,‡ and when his recollections of persons and events had lost their freshness. It must also be borne in mind that the friendship between the Duke and Sir James was interrupted by a quarrel, the cause and ground of which does not appear in the narrative of either of the parties; and, although there was a reconciliation between them ere the Duke died, we think it resembled the reconciliation between two eminent statesmen of our own day, which was thus described: "They have shaken hands and embraced, and hate each other more than ever."§ An acid flavour pervades Sir James's remarks on his former friend.

\* Before his death, in 1824, Sir J. B. Burges assumed the name of Lamb ("Bland Burges Papers," p. 350). At the time of his death he was in his seventy-third year. The Duke of Leeds died comparatively young, having completed his forty-eighth year two days only before he died.

† "Memoranda," Introduction, p. iii. ‡ "Bland Burges Papers," p. 55.

§ Lord Malmesbury's "Memories of an Ex-Minister," vol. ii. p. 120. As to the quarrel and reconciliation between the Duke of Leeds and Sir J. Burges, *vide* the "Bland Burges Papers," pp. 237-303.

To few people were the lines—

Fortune came smiling to his youth and woo'd it,  
And purpled greatness met his ripened years,

so applicable as to Francis Godolphin Osborne. He was born heir to a dukedom, a marquissate, an earldom, and viscountcies both in England and Scotland, and to the great landed possessions annexed to these titles. He became a member of the House of Commons. He was, in his father's lifetime, called up to the House of Lords as a baron. He became a member of George III.'s household, in the first instance as one of the Lords of the Bedchamber, and afterwards as Lord Chamberlain to Queen Charlotte; but more important office was in store for him. On the formation of the Pitt Ministry in 1783 he became Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs; he subsequently received the Garter. He was also Lord Lieutenant of the East Riding of Yorkshire. While he was so eminently successful in his public career, his private life was early overshadowed by a great misfortune. In his twenty-second year he married the daughter of the last Earl of Holderness, who was in her own right Baroness Conyers. Within six years the marriage was annulled in consequence of the lady's flight with Captain "Jack Byron," by whom she became the mother of Augusta Mary, half-sister of Lord Byron, the poet himself being the issue of the captain's marriage with Miss Gordon, after the death of Lady Conyers in 1784. The Duke, to console himself for the anguish of his divorce, took to himself another Anguish. In October, 1783, he married a lady of that name.

The editor of the "Memoranda" quotes a memoir of the Duke published, about the time of his death, in the *Gentleman's Magazine*. It is written in the Johnsonese common at that time, and, as our editor truly says, its writer "remarks, with conscious or unconscious irony, that the Duke of Leeds was not supposed to possess great talents, that his knowledge was not profound, that he was a considerable talker, that he never lost his consciousness of his position, and that he had not been very strongly inspired by the Muses." \* If a naval song on Howe's victory of "The Glorious First of June," attributed to the Duke, be a specimen of his poetical talents, there can be no doubt of the truth of the last part of this description. †

No information is given by either of the books before us as to the circumstances under which the friendship of the Duke and

\* "Memoranda," Introduction, p. cxi.

† A copy is in "The Dawson Collection" in the Penzance Public Library, vol. xiii. We are often indebted to this curious collection for information, and to the authorities of the library for courteously giving us access to it.



Sir James began. Sir James only tells us that "during the space of four or five years antecedent to 1780 a very intimate and unreserved friendship subsisted between Lord Carmarthen and myself." \* Sir James's acquaintance with William Pitt began in June, 1780, during the Gordon Riots, when they were both members of the junior Bar. Lord Carmarthen first met Pitt at a dinner given at this time by Burges in his chambers in Lincoln's Inn, and from that time the Marquis "cultivated Mr. Pitt's acquaintance."† At this dinner Gibbon also first met Pitt, and Burges's sketch of a scene between the great historian and the future Minister is a fit companion to Sir Walter Scott's sketch of the meeting of Adam Smith and Johnson.‡ Gibbon had then for some years been a member of the House of Commons, and was at the zenith of his fame. Burges describes him "as certainly not at all backward in availing himself of the deference universally shown to him by taking both the lead and a very ample share of the conversation in whatever company he might honour with his presence." Pitt had not then entered Parliament, and was unknown to the world. There is not only a *catena*, but a *consensus* of testimony to the truth of Wraxall's description of him as in manners, "if not repulsive, cold, stiff, without suavity or amenity. He seemed never to invite approach or to encourage acquaintance."§ Between these two men this scene occurred :—

Mr. Gibbon, nothing loth, took the conversation into his own hands, and very brilliant and pleasant he was during the dinner and for some time afterwards. He had just concluded, however, one of his best foreign anecdotes, in which he had introduced some of the fashionable levities of political doctrine then prevalent, and, with his customary tap on the lid of his snuff-box, was looking round to receive our tribute of applause, when a deep-toned but clear voice was heard from the bottom of the table very calmly and civilly impugning the correctness of the narrative, and the propriety of the doctrines of which it had been made the vehicle. The historian, turning a disdainful glance towards the quarter whence the voice proceeded, saw,

\* "Papers," p. 63. The Duke was known by his courtesy title of Marquis of Carmarthen until the death of his father, the fourth Duke, March 23, 1789.

† "Papers," p. 63.

‡ Dr. Johnson (says Sir Walter) no sooner saw Smith than he brought forward a charge against him for something in his famous letter on the death of Hume. Smith said he had vindicated the truth of the statement. "And what did the Doctor say?" was the universal query. "Why, he said—he said," said Smith, with the deepest impression of resentment—"he said, '*You lie.*'" "And what did you reply?" "I said, 'You are a son of a b—h.'"—*The Croker Papers*, vol. ii. p. 31.

§ Wraxall's "Posthumous Memoirs," vol. iii. pp. 469, 470.

for the first time, a tall, thin, and rather ungainly looking young man,\* who now sat quietly and silently eating some fruit. There was nothing very prepossessing or very formidable in his exterior, but, as the few words he had uttered appeared to have made a considerable impression on the company, Mr. Gibbon, I suppose, thought himself bound to maintain his honour by suppressing such an attempt to dispute his supremacy. He accordingly undertook the defence of the propositions in question, and a very animated debate took place between him and his youthful antagonist, Mr. Pitt, and for some time was conducted with great talent and brilliancy on both sides. At length the genius of the young man prevailed over that of his senior, who, finding himself driven into a corner from which there was no escape, made some excuse for rising from the table and walking out of the room. I followed him, and, finding he was looking for his hat, I tried to persuade him to return to his seat. "By no means," said he; "that young gentleman is, I have no doubt, extremely ingenious and agreeable, but I must acknowledge that his style of conversation is not exactly what I am accustomed to, so you must positively excuse me." And away he went in high dudgeon, notwithstanding that his friend (Col. Holroyd, afterwards Lord Sheffield) had come to my assistance. When we returned into the dining-room we found Mr. Pitt proceeding very tranquilly with the illustration of the subject from which his opponent had fled, and which he discussed with such ability, strength of argument, and eloquence that his hearers were filled with profound admiration.†

Gibbon then showed the same overweening self-esteem, the same dogmatic confidence in his own judgment, and the same fear and dislike of hearing his opinions controverted or reviewed which prevented him during the eight sessions he sat in Parliament from ever taking part in debate, though he himself says "it was prudence which condemned him to acquiesce in the humble station of a mute." On reading the account of this scene one cannot but wish that Pitt had encountered that other literary despot of those days, Johnson,‡ and driven him from the field as he drove Gibbon; and even more that the spirit and power of Pitt had in our own days fallen on some one who in like manner would have overthrown Carlyle. Burges adds to his account of this same dinner a sketch of Lord Carmarthen, as until the time of his succeeding to the dukedom we will henceforth call him. It professes to describe him as he was in 1780, but it was written thirty-eight years later, after the quarrel between him and Burges, and is coloured by the writer's later feelings and impressions.

\* Wraxall (*ubi supra*) says of Pitt, "In the formation of his person he was tall and slender, but without elegance or grace."

† "Papers," pp. 60, 61.

‡ It does not appear that Pitt and Johnson ever met.

At the period to which I have just referred [writes Burges], the Marquis of Carmarthen was about thirty years of age. He appeared then to have united in himself a combination of endowments such as have rarely fallen to the lot of the most favoured individual. Descended from noble ancestry, heir to the dukedom of Leeds, in possession of an ample fortune, and looking forward to the not distant accession to one still more considerable, he had in these respects no reason to envy any man; and not inferior were the advantages which Nature had liberally bestowed upon him. His talents were brilliant and acute, his memory uncommonly retentive, his power of conception so prompt that he was able at a glance to comprehend whatsoever was submitted to him, and to decide upon the line of action to be taken, while his ready wit, and his wonderful facility of expression, whether by speech or by writing, in prose or in verse, charmed and dazzled all with whom he associated. These rare qualities had received the cultivation derivable from an education at Westminster School and at Oxford, followed by several years' residence at foreign Courts. In addition to all this few men equalled him in personal beauty of face and figure. His countenance was most prepossessing, and seemed to indicate at once the quickness of his intellect and the suavity of his disposition. He had the gallant spirit of a noble gentleman, with the manner and address of an accomplished courtier. His outset in Parliament had afforded strong hopes of his future eminence, and the favour of his Sovereign had already singled him out for distinction by unmistakable proofs of his regard both on public and private grounds.

What follows is conceived and expressed in the true spirit of "a candid friend."

It must not, however, be supposed that there were no shades to temper or obscure this flood of brilliancy. There were, indeed, many weaknesses, many blemishes, and much misconduct which perhaps more than counterbalanced all his natural and acquired advantages, and which, as he advanced in life, sensibly lowered him in public estimation, and afforded a melancholy illustration of the insufficiency of rank, fortune, talents, and accomplishments to ensure happiness or good repute while unsupported by discretion and uncontrolled by principle; at the time, however, when our acquaintance commenced few circumstances had occurred to dim the lustre of his character. No young man at that day was so generally admired, nor was there any one of whose future success a higher expectation had been formed.\*

In justice to the Duke's memory it should be stated that Burges adduces no facts to support these grave and sweeping charges.

The memoir in the *Gentleman's Magazine* says of Car-

\* "Papers," pp. 62, 63.

marthen, "If he had any peculiar pride, it was an acknowledgment that his family sprung from a citizen of London."\* This was but an instance of the pride which apes humility. His connection with the City of London was very remote. The founder of the Osborne family was Edward Osborne, a Kentish squire's son, who "discovered a genius for mercantile affairs," and became Sheriff of London so far back as 1579 and Lord Mayor in 1583. He also became Sir Edward Osborne.

A more reasonable cause for pride, and which we have no doubt Carmarthen properly estimated, was that he was descended paternally and maternally from two, if not illustrious, yet prominent and versatile statesmen. On his father's side he was the direct descendant of Sir Thomas Osborne, a Yorkshire baronet, who, in the reign of Charles II., had in the House of Commons shown eminent talents for business and debate,† and who in 1673 became Lord Treasurer and was soon created Earl of Danby. It took him only twenty years to climb from the station of a Yorkshire country gentleman to the highest rank in the peerage.‡ He was created Marquis of Carmarthen in 1689 and Duke of Leeds in 1694. The fourth Duke married the youngest daughter of Francis Earl of Godolphin. The fifth Duke was thus descended from Sidney Godolphin, "the man who, zealous for no Government and useful to every Government, gradually became an almost indispensable part of the machinery of the State."§ Sidney Godolphin was created Baron Godolphin in 1684 and Earl Godolphin in 1706. He was the head of an old Cornish family, the Godolphins of Godolphin, of whom Camden says in his "*Britannia*" "that their virtues are not less eminent than their family is ancient." After the marriage of the fourth Duke his family assumed the name of Godolphin, and have ever since been known as the Godolphin Osbornes. By this marriage the extensive Cornish estates of the Godolphins were added to the large landed possessions which, by favour of the Crown, the first Duke of Leeds acquired.|| The Godolphin estates are still in the possession of the Duke of Leeds. Within sight of the spot where these lines are written rises Godolphin Hill; according to Camden the name Godolphin, anciently Godolcan, is a derivation from or corruption of the Phœnician word Godolonac, signifying a place of tin, and in his time "the hill was famous for store of tin mines." Now the store of tin mines is greatly reduced. On the slope of the hill in what was once a deer-park, with old gardens and fish-ponds, stand the remains of the mansion-house

---

\* Quoted in Introduction, p. xi.

† Macaulay's "*History of England*," chap. ii.

§ *Ibid.* chap. xi.

‡ *Ibid.* chap. xx.

|| *Ibid.* chap. xxv.

of Godolphin, now occupied as a farm-house. A large and lofty apartment called "the King's room" is, according to a vague tradition, the library in which Sidney Godolphin, the Minister to four successive Sovereigns, wrote his despatches. An old dining-hall, with a fine carved roof, still exists, which was probably the place where he indulged in the low and frivolous pursuits to which he was addicted.\*

In some respects Carmarthen's character resembled that of both the statesmen from whom he was descended. Of the first Duke, Macaulay says: "he was not a man whose character, if tried by any high standard of morality, would appear to merit approbation. He was greedy of wealth and honours, corrupt himself, and a corrupter of others." † He served not only Charles II., but James II., yet he signed the invitation to William III. to come over, and in William's interest seized York. He gained considerable influence with William, and became his chief Minister, but the Whig party "would not believe that he had from his heart renounced those arbitrary doctrines for which he had once been zealous, or that he could bear true allegiance to a Government sprung from resistance." ‡ It certainly is remarkable that towards the end of his career, while he was insulted as a Williamite at Bath, he was considered as a staunch Jacobite at St. Germain's.§ Macaulay thinks that there is no evidence that he corresponded with the exiled family. The Duke's maternal ancestor, Sidney Godolphin, had been, says Macaulay, "bred a page at Whitehall, and had early acquired all the flexibility and the self-possession of a veteran courtier. He was laborious, clear-headed, and profoundly versed in the details of finance. Every Government, therefore, found him a useful servant, and there was nothing in his opinions or in his character which could prevent him from serving any Government." "Sidney Godolphin, said Charles II., is never in the way and never out of the way." This pointed remark "goes far to explain Godolphin's extraordinary success in life." || "Godolphin learned some things which shook his confidence in the stability of the Revolution government. He began to think, as he would himself have expressed it, that he had betted too deep on the Revolution, and that it was time to hedge." ¶ He was suspected—he said without reason—of secret dealings with St. Germain's, and in consequence of that suspicion, before the death of William III., retired from office. At the accession of Anne we find him again

\* *Vide* Macaulay's "History," chap. ii.

† *Ibid.* chap. xvi.

§ *Ibid.* chap. xx.

¶ *Ibid.* chap. xvii.

‡ *Ibid.*

|| *Ibid.* chap. ii.

in place, and by country squires and rectors he was believed—as they also believed Marlborough to be—strongly attached to the Prerogative and to the Church. None of Anne's Ministers stood so high in her favour as the Lord Treasurer Godolphin and the Captain-General Marlborough. But, to the mortification and disgust of the country gentlemen and country clergymen, those statesmen saw that it was both for the "public interest and for their own interest to adopt a Whig policy."\*

The fifth Duke of Leeds certainly led his contemporaries to believe that as a politician he was as little to be depended on as his paternal ancestor the first Duke, or his maternal ancestor Godolphin. George III. spoke of "his capricious and variable disposition."† Horace Walpole described him "as a light, variable young man of very moderate parts and less principle."‡ Elsewhere he speaks of him "as the weathercock Marquis." The opinion of him formed by his once intimate friend Burges we have already mentioned. The editor of the "Memoranda" remarks, we think truly, that "The vanity of the Duke of Leeds was a serious deduction from his political influence."§

The earliest memorandum|| relates to a job which the Duke thus euphoniously describes: "In order to accommodate the K.'s service, some arrangement was to take place in order to gratify Sir William Meredith, newly come over from Opposition." To carry out this job it was proposed that the then Duke of Leeds should resign his sinecure place of Chief Justice in Eyre north of Trent, "and retire upon a pension." His son parenthetically observes that the then Comptroller of the Household should also resign and the renegade baronet be appointed in his room, and that at the same time Carmarthen should be brought into Parliament. The Duke would not give up his sinecure, even for a pension, but his son was brought into Parliament, a Ministerial nominee was put out and Carmarthen put in Eye, which (by the Redistribution Act has ceased to exist as a borough) was the constituency in whose name Carmarthen first sat in Parliament. Sir William Meredith received the price of his change of party.¶ This man was in his time of some

\* Macaulay, "Essay on Addison." † "Bland Burges Papers," p. 238.

‡ As quoted in the "Bland Burges Papers," p. 61, note.

§ Introduction, p. xx.

|| Prefixed to this memorandum is this note: "These memorandums were not begun to be set down till July, 1780; consequently many things of some consequence, or at least interesting to myself, may be omitted."

¶ "Memoranda," pp. 1, 2, and notes. The date of these transactions was 1774.

note in the House of Commons. He is described by Mr. Trevelyan as "a convert from Jacobite opinions," who, in the Middlesex election, and in the warfare between Parliament and the Press, "bore his part in defence of Constitutional liberty with a scrupulous fairness and an almost pathetic candour which won the good-will of his opponents, and were not always to the taste of the more impetuous of his allies."\* Anticipating the labours of Romilly, he "protested against the barbarity and inefficiency" of our then existing criminal code. In 1772 he presented the celebrated Feathers Tavern petition, which gave rise to an ever-memorable debate. The object of the petition, it will be remembered, was to relieve clergymen of the Established Church and graduates of the universities from the burthen of subscribing to the Thirty-nine Articles, and to restore to them their undoubted rights as Protestants of "interpreting Scripture for themselves, without being tied to any human comment or explanation." Unsuccessful at that time, Meredith returned to the charge in 1773 and again in 1774, but he had then lost his moral influence over the House by his accepting the white wand of the Comptroller of the Household. He was taunted by Burke, amid general laughter, "with lacking the wisdom of Moses, though he now possessed the rod of Aaron,"† and the sense of the House was so evidently against Meredith that he did not venture to divide.

At the General Election of 1774 Carmarthen was returned, with a relation, for another extinguished borough, not in Suffolk, but in Cornwall—Helston—which had been constantly represented by some of the Godolphin family.‡ Helston was in its time a harbour of refuge for law officers of the Crown. Sir Wm. Noy, of ship-money notoriety, sat for it in the Stuart times. In our own day Sir W. Baliol Brett, rejected at Rochdale, sought and found a refuge at Helston. Shortly after the election Carmarthen's colleague lost his life, and shortly after that event he himself—his return being petitioned against—lost his seat.

Previous to the meeting of the new Parliament [he says], Lord North sent for me and told me he wished I would propose Sir Fletcher Norton for Speaker. As I was no great admirer of that gentleman's character, I wished to be excused, and objected to it, alleging for my reason that I thought it would come with more propriety from some member who had sat longer than I had.§

\* "Early History of C. J. Fox," p. 364.

† *Ibid.* pp. 431, 433, 439.

‡ Godolphin is in the immediate neighbourhood of Helston.

§ "Memoranda," p. 4.

Sir Fletcher Norton during his ten years' occupancy of the Speaker's chair incurred the hostility of all parties. When the House, during its warfare with the printers, committed the Lord Mayor and a brother alderman to the Tower, the Speaker and other members were hanged in effigy on Tower Hill. One of his colleagues in this display of popular hatred, addressing him in debate, said, "The patriots indeed gave out that I died penitent, but that you, Sir, remained hardened to the last." \* In the debates on the Royal Marriage Bill (1772), the Speaker, "whose faults were not in the direction of timidity, was induced to descend into the lists of debate, but he was no sooner back beneath his canopy than he found himself pelted with sarcasms, against which his character afforded him the scantiest protection." Burke hurled at him a taunt "much appreciated by the House, which had observed nothing in Sir Fletcher Norton's parliamentary career inconsistent with the reputation for taking fees on both sides that he had acquired during his practice at the Bar;" and Barre "gave vent, with a breadth of phrase in which the cotemporaries of Smollett saw nothing amiss, to the most astounding imputation that the member of a Senate ever ventured to level against its president." † At a later stage of the Bill he was the object of a succession of attacks by Fox. Supreme instances of the "art of assailing a bad cause in the person of a questionable individual." ‡ Whether Sir Fletcher sought to curry favour with the Opposition by showing independence of, or animosity to, the Crown, we know not, but in 1777, on presenting to the King in Parliament the Household Bill, he said, "The House had granted his Majesty a very great additional revenue, great beyond example, great beyond your Majesty's highest *expense*." § These words were an unpardonable offence to the King. Sir Fletcher was also suspected of the still more unpardonable sin of favouring the American colonies; he therefore became an object of George III.'s unrelenting hatred, and when the new Parliament met in 1780 Sir Fletcher was opposed by the Ministry, and Mr. Cornewall, a nominee of the Court, was chosen Speaker by a considerable majority. || He owed his election to the interest of Charles Jenkinson, Secretary at War, one of "the King's friends," and afterwards the first Earl of Liverpool—who had married his sister. The new Speaker possessed every "physical quality requisite to ornament the place; a sonorous voice, a manly as well as imposing figure, and a commanding deportment." ¶

\* "Early History of C. J. Fox," p. 399, note.

† *Ibid.* p. 465.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 470.

§ "Memoranda," p. 4, note.

|| *Ibid.* p. 34.

¶ Wraxall, quoted in the "Burgess Papers," p. 127, note.



In other respects he was not suited for his high office. We have lately heard complaints, we fear well founded, of the deterioration of the tone and manners of the House of Commons, but the House of 1880 would not have tolerated in its Speaker what the House of 1780 seems to have permitted without demur. "Mr. Speaker Cornwall, during the time he occupied the Speaker's chair, had a pewter pot constantly at hand, from which he imbibed large quantities of his favourite liquor, considerably detracting from the dignity of his office and personal demeanour. The '*Rolliad*,' alluding to the Speaker's chair, observes:—

There Cornwall sits and ah! compelled by fate,  
Must sit for ever through the long debate,  
Save when compelled by Nature's sovereign will,  
Sometimes to empty, and sometimes to fill.  
Like sad Prometheus fastened to the rock,  
In vain he looks for pity to the clock.  
In vain the power of strengthening porter tries,  
And nods to Bellamy for fresh supplies.

The quantity of porter he drank was in the habit of producing a somnolency which on more than one occasion is said to have caused considerable inconvenience to the House.\* If his successor, said Burges, succeeds in restoring regularity and decency in the House, he will be entitled to great credit.†

After being unseated, Carmarthen made no attempt to re-enter the House of Commons, and in May, 1776, "in compliment to his father-in-law, Lord Holdernes, a solemn phantom, who owed his appointment to his insignificance and his wife," ‡ Carmarthen entered the Upper House in the middle period of the North Ministry. As a member of the King's Household he was required to support, and did support, the King's Ministry; he soon became dissatisfied with their conduct of the American War and of affairs generally.§ Prior to the meeting of Parliament in November, 1779, "two of the best members of the Ministry, Lord Gower, Lord President, and Lord Weymouth, one of the Secretaries of State, resigned." This further persuaded Carmarthen of the necessity of a change and determined him to resign office.|| Lord North himself told the King "that Gower's resignation at that moment must be the ruin of the

\* "Jesse George Selwyn and his Contemporaries," vol. iv. p. 380. Conf. Wrexall, as quoted by Burges, *ubi supra*. Mr. Speaker Cornwall died January 2, 1789. His predecessor, who had been created Lord Grantley, died the day before.

† *Ibid.* p. 5, note.

‡ "Papers," p. 128.

§ *Ibid.* p. 17. Carmarthen was at this time Lord Chamberlain to the Queen.

|| *Ibid.*

Administration."\* Before the Houses adjourned for Christmas, Shelburne in the Upper House and Burke in the Commons gave notice of motions for Economical Reform. These motions gave rise to the modern system of petitioning Parliament.

During the recess [Carmarthen relates] I received a summons from a committee of gentlemen at York to attend a meeting there upon December 30, to consider of the necessity of economy in order to support the expense of the war, and for drawing up a petition for the House of Commons for the abolishing useless and exorbitant or unmerited pensions and salaries, and applying the produce to the public service. I could not but approve of the petition at this time, but apologized for my personally not attending the meeting.†

But the timid and ever-cautious politician is careful to add this note:—

As far as the petition I agreed with the meeting, but could by no means approve of the idea of forming associations and committees of correspondence, which they thought proper to do, as no one could know to what dangerous lengths such institutions might proceed though perhaps originating from the best and most constitutional principles.‡

The Yorkshire meeting was considered by George III. and his friends as a sounding of the "trumpet of sedition."§ Carmarthen received a note from Lord North requesting to see him; he went.

Lord North [Carmarthen relates] told me he wished to speak to me in regard to the York meeting, which he represented as a very improper measure, and merely the effect of party, and that he was sure I would readily concur with other noblemen and gentlemen of the county in expressing our disapprobation, and in preventing our friends from attending it. The Duke of Northumberland was shown into the room where we were, and entirely agreed with his lordship. I answered I did by no means see the measure in that light, that I thought nobody could object to the necessity of economy at the present juncture, and that I could by no means disapprove of the plan of the meeting so far as I was informed of it, that if confusion was to be apprehended from the meeting I was afraid what his lordship had suggested would rather augment than prevent such conclusion. His lordship then desired the Duke of Northumberland and myself to walk into the next room where we should find some more Yorkshire

\* Sir G. C. Lewis's "Administrations of Great Britain," p. 21.

† "Memoranda," pp. 17, 18. It will be remembered that Carmarthen was then Lord Lieutenant of the East Riding of Yorkshire.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 18, note. We should think this note was written some time after the original text.

§ A phrase applied by George III. to the great Lord Chatham; *vide* "Administrations of Great Britain," p. 9, notes.

gentlemen. The company agreed with his lordship. I, however, still retained my former opinion, which I repeated, and added that if they were apprehensive of any improper or dangerous proposals being made at the meeting I rather should think it a reason for encouraging our friends to attend in order to oppose such proposals, which otherwise might go forth (considering the notice for the meeting had been so long given) for the real and general sense of the county.\*

A difference of opinion with the King's Ministers on so great a subject as the Yorkshire meeting was to Carmarthen an additional reason to resign, and accordingly, on January 27, 1780, he "resigned the Gold Key into the Queen's hands," giving as his reason that he found "supporting the present Ministry was not effectually supporting the King's interests."† The next day he had an audience with the King.

I told his Majesty [he narrates] it was the first time it ever gave me pain to enter his closet; that the step I had taken, far from proceeding from any fractious motive, arose merely from my ardent desire for his prosperity; that though I had a very high opinion of some still remaining in his Administration, yet there were others whose removal I humbly conceived necessary for his service; that I flattered myself such removals would have taken place during the recess, but that not being the case, as I could not profess supporting those men I so much disapproved, I thought it incumbent on me to resign my place, the former appointment to which I should always look upon as the greatest honour. . . . The King seemed agitated, and frequently made use of the words, "I am very sorry." At the conclusion he said he was sure I acted from conviction, and, therefore, as a man of honour.‡

It is in referring to Carmarthen's resignation that Walpole calls him "the weathercock Marquis," meaning, we suppose, it showed the way in which the wind of public opinion blew.§ From notes added by Carmarthen himself, it appears that there was only one member of the Government of whom he had "a high opinion"—Lord Chancellor Thurlow—and that the three members whose removal "he conceived necessary" were Lord North, the Premier, Lord Sandwich, First Lord of the Admiralty, and Lord George Germain, one of the Secretaries of State, who was chiefly responsible for the maladministration of American affairs. Carmarthen published "A Letter to Lord Thurlow," advocating a change of Government, and particularly the removal of these three noble lords.|| The Yorkshire meeting was attended by freeholders owning property to the amount of £800,000 a year, and the petition was signed by no less than 9,000 gentry,

\* "Memoranda," pp. 18, 19. † *Ibid.* p. 20.

‡ *Ibid.* pp. 21, 22.

§ *Ibid.* p. 22, note 1.

|| *Ibid.* p. 21.

clergy, and freeholders. One or two and twenty other counties, and two or three towns voted similar petitions; among the petitioning towns was Westminster. The petition was voted by a meeting held in Westminster Hall, at which "Charles Fox harangued the people finely and warmly;" he was then for the first time proposed and "joyfully accepted" as a candidate for Westminster at the next election.\*

At first, according to Walpole, the Court was "struck dumb" by this popular movement, "but soon rallied." Carmarthen's support of Economical Reform, and still more his advocating the removal of those whom the King called his "present efficient Ministers" † awoke in the Royal mind "the implacable hatred" he bore to those he thought his enemies.

February 8, 1780, was the day appointed for Shelburne's motion for a committee of both Houses to inquire into the public expenditure. On that day—we again quote Carmarthen's own words—

as I was going to dress in order to attend the House of Lords, I received an official letter from the Earl of Hillsborough, Secretary of State, containing my dismission from the offices of Lord Lieutenant and Custos Rotulorum of the East Riding of Yorkshire. My surprise would scarcely have been greater had it been a warrant of commitment to the Tower. I went down to the House and spoke for the motion; in the course of my speech, I took care to give the real motive for my resignation, as well as to comment upon my dismission.‡ At the same time, and for like reasons, Lord Pembroke was dismissed from the Lord Lieutenancy of Wiltshire, and the Duke of Richmond from that of Sussex.§

Carmarthen was now fairly "launched into Opposition, and received much civility from the members who composed it." Shelburne, who thought himself ill-used by the King, was intriguing against the Ministry. Carmarthen adds another to the *catena* of unfavourable characters of him :—

Lord Shelburne possesses great talents for a statesman, but he is not always to be trusted. At first he was a very indifferent speaker, but now,|| though not an agreeable, is yet a most able speaker, possessed of vast information and remarkably fluent. His lordship was certainly at one time a very great favourite of the King's, but thinking to supplant Lord Bute, who had governed the King from a child, he drove at too furious a rate, and fell a sacrifice to his want of prudence. Great and disappointed ambition joined to great and cultivated abili-

\* "Memoranda," pp. 22, 23, notes; in the note on p. 22, Charles Fox is miscalled Charles Fry.

† In a letter to Lord North, quoted in "Administrations of Great Britain," p. 15.

‡ "Memoranda," pp. 22, 23.

§ *Ibid.* p. 22, note 2.

|| 1780.

ties, as there is no saying where they will stop, render this nobleman as dangerous as powerful.\*

The high-handed dismissal of Carmarthen and Pembroke gave Shelburne an opportunity of attacking the Ministry, and he sought Carmarthen's permission to bring his case before the House. "The measure, Shelburne said, from its being as unusual as violent, had alarmed people in general, that the *City of London* saw it in a light which threatened the freedom of Parliament. He seemed," continues Carmarthen, "to wish to know what had passed at my audience, but I only told him that from the manner of his Majesty I had no reason to apprehend the ensuing mark of his displeasure."†

Shelburne then made a motion that the dismissal of Carmarthen and Pembroke was a direct attack on the freedom of debate and parliamentary proceedings. In the course of the debate Carmarthen desired the Ministry to give any reason for his removal, but they would not. As things then stood it was a matter of course that the motion should be lost by a large majority.‡

Carmarthen inclined more to the Rockingham Whigs than to Shelburne and his followers. He found he agreed with Rockingham "in most essential matters."

The shortening the duration of Parliaments, a new mode of election, disfranchising what are vulgarly called rotten boroughs, and an additional number of county members, were now [he says] the favourite topics in the committees of the different counties,§ and seemed to meet with more advocates (both as to respect and numbers) than could have been, I think, imagined. The most respectable part of the Opposition (viz., the Cavendishes, Lord Rockingham and his friends, the Duke of Richmond excepted) seemed to disapprove this essential innovation in the Constitution, which was, however, said to be approved of by Lords Shelburne, Camden, &c.||

In fact, there was no unanimity in the Opposition. Shelburne could not work with Rockingham, who was entirely under the influence of Burke. Burke had been outrageous with Shelburne for his economical plan in the House of Lords, which Burke said was a matter wholly belonging to the House of Commons; while Shelburne, on his part, thought very contemptuously of Burke's

\* "Memoranda," pp. 25, 26.

† *Ibid.* pp. 26, 27.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 27. In the division the contents were 39, the non-contents 92.

§ These committees had been appointed by the meetings which had voted the petitions for Economical Reform.

|| "Memoranda," p. 28; conf. p. 35. The Duke of Richmond was in favour of Manhood Suffrage and Annual Parliaments: see p. 30, note 3. As to Rockingham's opinions on this question, see p. 35, note.

commendation of the taxes in the House of Commons.\* There was scarcely more unanimity in the Ministry. Carmarthen relates that on one occasion the Chancellor "attacked the Ministers in so violent a manner that it occasioned much speculation, and gave rise to a report of his being soon to resign."† Carmarthen also narrates a conversation with Lord Hillsborough‡ which illustrates the servility of the Court and Cabinets of George III.

Hillsborough [he relates] began a conversation relative to my resignation. He said how sorry he was for it, that he thought it a wrong step, and was sure I must have repented of it. I assured his lordship upon my honour I had not repented of it, and that, were the circumstances to exist again, I would act in the same manner. He said, except upon very particular occasions indeed, the nobility should always co-operate with the Crown, from whom alone they derived their consequence. I told him no one was more sincerely attached to the Crown than I was, and, notwithstanding the hard treatment I had met (and which I must attribute to my having been totally misunderstood, if not misrepresented), the King had not a subject in his dominions more sincerely anxious for his prosperity. I repeated in pretty plain terms to his lordship that, as the same causes which had occasioned my resignation still subsisted, my sentiments must of course continue precisely the same; that I could not pretend, nor did I wish, ever to be above the feeling an obligation or an injury, and that I confessed I had been much more hostile to the Government than I should have been had I not been ill-treated after the fair and, as I conceive, honourable part I had acted towards the King.§

It will be remembered that the King himself admitted Carmarthen had acted "like a man of honour."|| Carmarthen here asserted his independence in a degree unusual amongst even the patricians of that time. "When," to quote Thackeray, "George III. spoke a few kind words to him, Lord Chatham burst into tears of reverential joy and gratitude, so awful was the idea of the monarch, and so great the distinctions of rank."¶

At the beginning of 1782 the fall of the North Ministry was nigh at hand. They thought proper that some mark of Royal favour should be bestowed on Lord George Germaine, to whose mismanagement the loss of the American colonies was mainly owing. For his conduct at the battle of Minden \*\* he had been dismissed from all his military employments, and declared by a court-martial to have been guilty of disobeying orders, and to be unfit to serve his Majesty in any military capacity whatever. In

\* "Memoranda," pp. 41, 42; conf. p. 48.

† *Ibid.* p. 43.

‡ One of the Secretaries of State. § "Memoranda," p. 45. || *Ibid.* p. 22.

¶ "Lectures on the Four Georges—George the Third." \*\* In 1759.

a debate on American affairs,\* Fox denounced him "as that inauspicious and ill-omened character, whose arrogance and presumption, whose ignorance and inability, had brought evil upon the country."† Nevertheless, the Ministers resolved to create their colleague a peer. Carmarthen had the sense and spirit to see that in face of the sentence of the court-martial, which had been confirmed by the Crown, given out in public orders, and remained unreversed, the proposed creation was injurious to the honour of the Crown and the dignity of the peerage, and, unlike the majority of the peers, he had the courage of his opinions. He consulted the Chancellor (Thurlow), whose judgment he rated highly, and who was never unwilling to undermine his colleagues. Thurlow said he thought "a good deal as Carmarthen did on the subject, and that he thought it not very flattering to the House the making people peers when they did not know what else to do with them," but the wily Chancellor did not absolutely commit himself on the question. Carmarthen moved, by way of resolution, "That it is highly derogatory to the honour of this House to recommend to the Crown a person labouring under the heavy censures comprehended in the following sentence of a court-martial and public orders [here setting forth the sentence and orders] as a proper person to be raised to the dignity of the peerage." A debate arose, and the motion was got rid of, not by a direct negative, but by the question of adjournment being carried. The next day the House met early, and Germaine took his seat as Viscount Sackville. Two days later Carmarthen again brought on his motion, when the Chancellor, notwithstanding what we know to have been his real opinions, defended Sackville, "not by meeting the question so much on its real ground as by combating the sentence itself." Among the Opposition there was as little spirit as unanimity. Rockingham said he could not quite agree "with the motion, and gave no vote." In the division twenty-seven peers only and one proxy voted for the motion, while eighty-one peers and twelve proxies voted against it. Carmarthen entered a spirited protest‡ in the sense of his resolution.

The North Ministry was at length driven from office, and the Rockingham-Shelburne Ministry was formed. Both those noble lords asked Carmarthen if there was any particular employment he desired to have; he said there was none. The office of joint Postmaster-General was offered him, but declined; he preferred a diplomatic appointment. He was at once restored to his Lord

---

\* In 1777.

† "Administrations of Great Britain," pp. 11, 12, and note. Croker absurdly supposed that Germaine might have been Junius: see Croker's letters to Sir J. B. Burges, "Burges Papers," p. 323.

‡ "Memoranda," pp. 53-58. The protest will be found in the note at p. 57.

Lieutenancy. The new Ministry had two sources of weakness—the hostility of the King and their mutual distrust. At Shelburne's interview with Carmarthen he used these words: "I have made great sacrifices to the Rockinghams, I hope I am acting with honest men;" \* while Lord Temple, "at a masquerade," mentioned to Carmarthen his apprehension of Shelburne's conduct towards Rockingham. "He said he much feared he wanted to play him false, and told me for certain Lord Shelburne had spoken to a person wishing them † to be Secretary of State in case of a vacancy, which his lordship concluded was owing to some secret plan of removing Mr. Fox, and of course Lord Rockingham and his friends." He said he "wished Lord Rockingham should know it." ‡ Carmarthen sensibly dissuaded Temple from increasing the distrust between the Ministers. The editor of the "Memoranda," in a note, suggests that the person referred to by Temple was William Pitt. We think that there is strong probability that he is right in his surmise.

In the new Ministry, to please the King, Thurlow was continued as Chancellor. Pitt, later on, described him as "opposing everything, proposing nothing, and agreeing to anything." He violently opposed several of his colleagues' measures, and his speeches were thought to represent the Royal feelings, and were therefore looked upon as extremely hostile to the new Ministers. When reproached by one of them with thus verifying Sir Philip Francis' character of him as "the inveterate enemy of all human action," he replied "that he thought it a peculiar hardship that his manner, that of a plain man who studied nothing but to convey his sentiments clearly and intelligibly, should be imputed to him as if arising from motives of indiscriminate opposition or to intentional rudeness." §

A volunteer movement began at this time, and the question arose whether by law a Dissenter, in order to receive a commission in a volunteer corps, would be obliged to take the Sacrament according to the rites of the Established Church. The Chancellor said, "It certainly was so." The repeal of the Tests Acts, hereafter to be one of the greatest achievements of the Whig party, had not then found favour in the sight of its leaders. Shelburne surprised Carmarthen, "though agreeably, with observing that it was necessary to be cautious in any matter relating to tests, &c., and that in all time the Church of England were the people to stand by." ||

Burges states that Carmarthen "during the Rockingham

\* "Memoranda," p. 65.

† Sic in original.

‡ "Memoranda," pp. 66, 67.

§ Ibid. p. 67, note.

|| P. 69. The first motion for the Repeal of the Tests Act was made March 28, 1787, when it was supported by Fox and opposed by Pitt.



Administration in 1782 was nominated ambassador to the Court of France, but did not take up the appointment in consequence of the death of Lord Rockingham, and the consequent change of Ministry.\* Here Burges confuses dates. Carmarthen was nominated French ambassador in February, 1783, after Rockingham's death, and in the Premiership of Shelburne; but the appointment was never carried out, owing to the inability of Shelburne to maintain his post against the coalition of Fox and North.†

The death of Rockingham led to the resignation of Fox and the other pure Whigs. This has been attributed to Fox's pique at the appointment of Shelburne to the Treasury, but Carmarthen relates a conversation with Fox, in which Fox put the reasons for his resignation in a light in which we think they have not appeared before.

We entered upon the subject of his late resignation, for which I told him I was sincerely sorry, and feared the abrupt manner in which it was done might prejudice him materially in the opinion of the world; he owned he thought it would, that it was impossible for any one to form a true opinion on the case who had not been in the Cabinet; he said he did not wonder if people were displeased with him, but that he acted from conviction, and would never hesitate to sacrifice popularity where it could not be preserved but at the expense of his character. He said he looked upon Lord Shelburne to be as much a tool of the King's as ever Jenkinson had been; that the Duke of Richmond was much hurt at the step he had taken, and yet, says he, when I asked the Duke of Richmond before thirty or forty people on Saturday, at a meeting at Lord Fitzwilliam's, if he could trust one single word of Lord Shelburne's, his Grace answered in the negative.‡

Sir G. Cornwall Lewis condemns Fox's resignation; nevertheless, he says that "If Mr. Fox, after a trial of three months, found that he could not act satisfactorily with Lord Shelburne, it must be admitted that he was justified in refusing to hold office in his Administration." It is plain from this conversation that experience taught Fox that he could not usefully or properly remain in a Cabinet of which Shelburne was the head. George III. told Carmarthen that it was Fox's wish to have an inactive First Lord of the Treasury, "but one whom he himself could answer for clearly in order that he might govern in his name;" || but at that time his Majesty's prejudice against Fox was so strong that no opinion of his on Fox or his conduct is of any

\* "Papers," p. 63.

† "Memoranda," p. 79.

‡ *Ibid.* pp. 72, 73.

§ "Administrations of Great Britain," p. 55. The question of Fox's resignation is discussed pp. 49-58.

|| "Memoranda," p. 74.

weight. Carmarthen was disappointed in Shelburne as Premier. "His conduct," he says, "appeared to me totally devoid of spirit and inconsistent with the opinion I had entertained of his lordship's activity of mind, particularly on occasions that called for vigorous measures. I confidentially mentioned to him that I had my doubts a certain person might not be acting a fair part towards him. He appeared struck at my suggestion, and only answered, 'You know him.'"<sup>\*</sup>

Carmarthen was not singular in the unfavourable opinion he formed of Shelburne. Lord Grantham, one of the Secretaries of State, "perfectly agreed" with him, and Lord Temple, the "Lord Lieutenant of Ireland," said Shelburne's head seemed to have "been turned by his high situation, that he did not sufficiently communicate his ideas to his brother Ministers, but assumed a dictatorial tone too frequently, and that he, Lord T., had been obliged to enter into an explanation with him by letter on that very subject, after which Lord Shelburne corrected himself in that particular during the remainder of his administration."<sup>†</sup>

The Coalition Ministry was abruptly dismissed. Temple abandoned the attempt to form a Cabinet. The King therefore sent for Pitt, "and placed in his strong if untried hands the helm of government." Gibbon, notwithstanding his unfavourable first impression of the new Minister, declared that "a youth of twenty-five, who raises himself to the government of an empire by the power of genius and the reputation of virtue is not less glorious to himself than to the country."<sup>‡</sup> Carmarthen became Foreign Secretary. Burges throws some light on the reason of this appointment. Fox's India Bill "brought about a general rallying of the King's friends. Carmarthen was regarded in the light of "a very useful associate by Mr. Pitt and Lord Thurlow, the leaders of what was then a very weak and inconsiderable party. The nature of the business not admitting of delay, and the success of their plans depending upon the maintenance of inviolable secrecy, few persons were admitted to their meetings, which frequently took place at a house I then occupied." Then follows a passage eminently characteristic of the writer. "I was of course present on such occasions, when everybody assumed the privilege of giving his opinion without other distinction than such as must always arise from superiority of talent or intelligence."<sup>§</sup>

---

<sup>\*</sup> "Memoranda," p. 82. The King is plainly the certain person referred to.

<sup>†</sup> *Ibid.* p. 89.

<sup>‡</sup> Letter to Lord Eliot of October 27, 1784, quoted in Stanhope's *Life of Pitt*, vol. i. p. 237, and "Burges Papers," p. 66, note.

<sup>§</sup> "Burges Papers," p. 61.

There were sufficient reasons for Pitt choosing Carmarthen for a colleague. He was on the threshold of a dukedom; and in 1784 a Duke was a far greater power in politics than is a Duke in 1885. Already in possession of large landed estates and heir to others, his electioneering influence in the counties was great, and usually, though not always, he was able to control the return of the two members for Helston, and over those members, when returned, he exercised strict supervision and control.\* He was also a "variable" politician, and it was desirable to attach him by the ties of office to a Ministry which was then new and weak. Pitt could "Bear like the Turk no rival near the Throne."

"To avoid everything," says Burges, who at that time knew him well, "that bore a semblance of competition or rivalry was a sure passport to his intimacy and confidence."† He wanted an ornamental rather than a useful Foreign Secretary. All that was important in the duties of that office he meant to discharge, and did discharge, himself. Carmarthen had in his composition more of the willow than the oak, and a Foreign Secretary to whom Pitt would have been obliged to give way, as he was afterwards compelled to give way to Grenville, would not have been tolerated by Pitt in 1784.

"From 1784 to 1793," says the editor of the "Memoranda," "every important action of the Government bears the impress of the name of Pitt; the chief despatches are written by his hand, whether they are signed by Sydney, Leeds, or Grenville."‡

For proof of his statement he refers to the "original documents preserved in the English Foreign Office." Carmarthen admitted to Burges that he had nothing more to do with the celebrated Commercial Treaty with France, in 1787, "beyond affixing his signature to despatches which had been drafted by Mr. Pitt."

John Adams, the first Minister to St. James's from the newly recognized United States, describes Carmarthen "as a modest, amiable man, treats all men with civility, and is much esteemed by the Foreign Ministers as well as the nation, but is not an enterprising Minister."§ The editor of the "Burges Papers" comes to the conclusion that he was keen-sighted, "and possessed of much promptitude and energy at a moment of pressure, but fitful and uncertain, and deficient in close application."|| We

\* "Burges Papers," p. 172.

† *Ibid.*

‡ "Memoranda," Introduction, p. v., and see also p. 164, note. Pitt, wrote Dundas in 1787, is a real active member of the Board (of Control), and makes himself thoroughly master of the business. "Administrations of Great Britain," p. 168.

§ Quoted in the "Burges Papers," p. 62, from Stanhope's Life of Pitt, vol. i. p. 131.

|| "Burges Papers," p. 133.

suspect he had little influence in the Cabinet. Sir George Cornewall Lewis, in his "Administrations of Great Britain,"\* does not think him of enough importance to mention either his joining or leaving the Cabinet. Stanhope, in his Life of Pitt, merely says of Carmarthen† that he brought to the Government "more of polish than of weight." Wilberforce, in his Diaries, refers to most of the leading men of his time. He only once mentions him, and then only to contrast "the elegant Carmarthen with the pompous Thurlow." Lord Malmesbury, who knew him well, said he was "carried away more by his imagination and sanguine hopes, in which his string of toad-eaters encourage him, than by reason or reflection."‡ Carmarthen's "Toad Eaters" seem to have been well known to all his cotemporaries. "The new Administration [according to Burges] was hastily patched together, and was quite inadequate to the work that was to be done." The Cabinet, as originally formed, consisted, besides Pitt, of Thurlow, the obstructionist Chancellor; Earl Gower, the President of the Council, a man advanced in life; the Duke of Rutland, Lord Privy Seal, of whom Burges says: "Nothing was known of his abilities, and his premature death left it in doubt whether or not he possessed any;" Lord Howe, First Lord of the Admiralty, who, according to the same authority, was a brave and experienced seaman, but can "only be considered as a second-rate statesman;" Lord Sydney,§ Home Secretary, whose position was owing, in Burges's opinion, less to his "talents and acquirements" than to the fact of his daughter "having married Pitt's elder brother,|| and to his "having acquired a sort of technical knowledge which in some measure qualified him to discharge the functions of Home Secretary." Carmarthen was Foreign Secretary. The remaining member of the Cabinet was the Duke of Richmond, Master General of the Ordnance, of whom, and of the Lord President, Burges remarks that "they acquitted themselves equally to Mr. Pitt's satisfaction and their own."¶ There were, he adds, three gentlemen, however, who, though "not included in the Cabinet, had really more to do with the conduct of public affairs than some of the more ostensible members

\* Vol. i. p. 311.

† *Ibid.*

‡ Quoted in the "Burges Papers," pp. 149, 150.

§ Known in the House of Commons as Tommy Townshend, and so called in Goldsmith's admirable lines on Burke. When he was made a peer Carmarthen bestowed on him the title of Lord Tommy. See "Burges Papers," p. 67.

|| The second Lord Chatham.

¶ These opinions of the Cabinet will be found in the "Papers," pp. 66, 67, 68.

of the Government—Mr. Henry Dundas,\* Mr. Charles Jenkinson,† Mr. William Wyndham Grenville.‡

According to Carmarthen's account, Pitt laid great stress on his joining the Cabinet. "After many flattering expressions to me personally he expressed to me an earnest wish that I would take the seals for the Department of Foreign Affairs." Then followed the coquetry usual on such occasions; Carmarthen "begged to decline accepting the offer, as by no means thinking myself," so he says, "equal to the undertaking an employment of such great importance." Pitt "answered that the King desired it of me as an essential service at this juncture, when a moment's unnecessary delay might throw everything into the utmost confusion." At two o'clock on the same afternoon Carmarthen, "Whispering I'll ne'er consent, consented." "The King," he says, "received me in the kindest and most gracious manner, and testified in the warmest terms how much he felt himself obliged to me for coming into his service at so critical a moment." § The King's conduct was worthy of one whom successive Ministers found to be one of the most insincere of men—he was as resentful and unforgiving as he was stubborn and cunning. There is abundant proof that he never forgave Carmarthen for the independent conduct in punishment of which he was removed from his Lord Lieutenancy. Carmarthen naïvely relates his experience as a Cabinet Minister. "I found I could not prevail on the Cabinet to give that attention to foreign affairs that I thought necessary, and consequently afterwards gave them little trouble on the subject. Mr. Pitt, however, for some time applied himself to the correspondence with great assiduity." || This strengthens our conviction that Pitt desired to keep in his own hands the control of foreign affairs. Any activity, therefore, on the part of the Foreign Secretary was superfluous, and must needs be discouraged.

It is well known that the new Cabinet were strongly desirous of dissolving Parliament, and that the great obstacle to a dissolution was the necessity of first passing the annual Mutiny Act. The Opposition, having a majority in the Commons, could for a long time delay its passing. Burges says that Fox had announced

\* Afterwards Lord Melville. Burges draws a vivid and unfavourable portrait of Dundas (*vide* "Papers," pp. 87 *et seq.*), who, he says, "commenced his English career as the parliamentary prosecutor of our alleged peculator, and ended it by becoming himself the object of a parliamentary prosecution for peculation."

† Described by Macaulay as "the Captain of the prætorian band of the King's friends," afterwards successively Baron Hawkesbury and Earl of Liverpool.

‡ Afterwards Lord Grenville.

§ "Memoranda," pp. 91, 92.

|| *Ibid.* p. 101.

his intention to negative the Bill. Had the Bill been negated the army must have been disbanded. The Ministers vacillated in their deliberations, and their chief adviser, "the Chancellor, was perplexed." In this crisis, Burges, according to his own account, played "an important if not conspicuous part," which he thinks "sufficiently interesting to be described at some length." Carmarthen gives a full account of the proceedings of the Cabinet on this matter, in which he does not mention Burges. He says: "So strong was the tide without doors against Mr. Fox and his majority that they thought it prudent to pass the Mutiny Bill in compliance with the wishes of the public."\* Burges was not Carmarthen's private secretary, but seems to have been one of his informal advisers. He bears witness, as facts within his knowledge, to the alarm and vacillation of the Ministers. "My opinion," he tells us, "not being asked, I forbore to give it till Lord Carmarthen, speaking to me on the subject, begged I would suggest some means of obviating the impending danger." Burges's legal studies made him familiar with the subject, on which he prepared a paper. This he next day took to a Cabinet dinner.

I maintained [to quote his own words] that neither law nor parliamentary usage made it an indispensable necessity that a Mutiny Bill, though in some respects a Money Bill, should originate in the House of Commons. I insisted that it was a matter of indifference in which House it originated, because, since the Revolution, it had originated sometimes in one House, sometimes in the other, though most frequently in the House of Commons.

After adducing several instances in proof of this proposition, he continues :

From all this I draw two inferences. First, that a Mutiny Bill did not come within the definition of a Money Bill, so far as to make its introduction in the House of Commons indispensable. Secondly, that, should such a proceeding be deemed advisable, the Bill might consistently with parliamentary law and usage originate in the House of Lords.

The burst of self-praise which follows is as amusing as it is pardonable and natural. It is highly characteristic of its writer.

I need not attempt to describe the surprise and delight occasioned by this wonderful discovery, which any one might have made for himself if he had taken the trouble to look for it. *Dans le royaume des aveugles le borgne se fait roi* ; and in a party of ignorant persons a little knowledge goes a long way. The main point being thus secured, it remained to decide upon the course to be pursued. Considerable difference of opinion was expressed, until after a time I ventured to

---

\* "Memoranda," p. 99.

suggest that the simplest and most efficacious plan might be for Mr. Pitt to enclose a copy of the paper which had just been read to Mr. Fox, and request to be favoured with his determination one way or other, so as to regulate his own line of conduct. The suggestion was unanimously adopted, and a letter despatched that same evening with the enclosure. The effect, as I have already shown, was perfectly satisfactory to Ministers.

It is remarkable that Carmarthen, writing at the time, should omit all mention of this way of escape from so great and imminent a danger, and of the person who suggested it to the Cabinet, and that he attributes Fox's change of determination exclusively to another cause.<sup>\*</sup> It suggests that Burges, writing in 1818, exaggerates the importance of the advice he gave the Cabinet in 1784.\* The hindrance to dissolving Parliament being, from whatever cause, removed, the Cabinet proceeded to draw up the Royal Speech announcing the dissolution. As to this Carmarthen mentions a fact not, so far as we know, hitherto revealed.

The Duke of Richmond wished something might be said in the Speech on the subject of Parliamentary Reform. Mr. Pitt seemed to approve the idea. The Chancellor, Lord Gower, Lord Sydney and myself, however, could not help thinking it in many respects liable to very great objections, and after some conversation they agreed to its being omitted.<sup>†</sup>

Ere Carmarthen had held the seals for a year, his eyes, if not blinded by his vanity, must have been opened to the estimation in which he was really held by Pitt.

On October 15 (1784), I received [he records] a long and confidential letter from Mr. Pitt, in which, after many flattering expressions in respect to myself, and apologizing for the nature of the subject, which he said he never would have mentioned but from the firmest persuasion of my friendship, and that I would see the matter in question in the true light in which he meant it, and stating at the same time that my wishes would decide his conduct, he suggested the great acquisition Lord Camden would be to the Cabinet, but that, having sounded his lordship on the subject, he found him not desirous of entering into the Administration unless in conjunction with his friend the Duke of Grafton; that, such being the case, Mr. Pitt suggested that this arrangement should by no means be listened to without my full and sincere concurrence, as he saw no other way of bringing it about but by my taking some other situation suitable to my rank, &c., &c., and leaving the seals for the Duke of Grafton, not immediately, but at a future period; he again repeated many

\* The "Burges Papers," pp. 71, 72. Conf. "Memoranda," pp. 95, 98, 99.

† "Memoranda," p. 99.

encomiums on my conduct in my present office, and assured me that this idea had been communicated to nobody, and would go no farther till my sentiments were known.\*

It is most difficult, if not impossible, for a Minister to remain in office when the Premier lets him know he wants his place for some one else. Carmarthen therefore replied to Pitt, in the style usual on such occasions, "that his acceptance of office was by no means a matter of choice or inclination, but merely with a view of being of service to the King and to the public; that, the same principles still remaining in full force (as I trusted they ever would) in my mind, I should be equally ready to resign my office from the same motives."† Grafton's accession would have been a source of weakness, not of strength, to Pitt. The diatribes of Junius against Grafton were then fresh in the public mind, and by them the popular conception of Grafton was formed and now remains unchanged.

Doing penance [as Mr. Trevelyan truly says] for the accumulated sin and scandals of his colleagues, Grafton, while English is read, will continue to stand in his white sheet beneath the very centre of the dome in the Temple of History.‡

Probably Pitt received warnings against taking Grafton into his Cabinet, for, a day or two after he received Carmarthen's letter,

Mr. Pitt [he says] came to me at the office and expressed himself under the greatest obligations to me for the manner in which I had received his communication, and, after giving much more praise to my behaviour upon this business than it was, I think, entitled to, assured me he could by no means think of proceeding in it, and begged me to look upon it as entirely dropped. In a few weeks afterwards Lord Gower accepted the Privy Seal, and Lord Camden was appointed President of the Council.§

"Of the Foreign Administration of the Duke of Leeds," says his editor, "we have only fragments," and those fragments, we may add, have at this day no interest. We find nothing noteworthy in the memoranda between 1784 and 1788. It is from Burges that we gain our information on an event in Carmarthen's Ministerial career which he very naturally does not mention. In return for Burges's help in the affairs of the Mutiny Bill, Pitt

\* "Memoranda," pp. 104, 105.

† *Ibid.* p. 105.

‡ "Early History of Charles James Fox," p. 241.

§ "Memoranda," p. 106. Burges, in describing the formation of Pitt's Cabinet, says ("Papers," p. 66), "Lord Camden soon made way for Lord Gower;" the fact was, Lord Gower made room for Lord Camden. Burges is not accurate in details.



promised to bring him into Parliament. That promise, from some cause, he failed to keep, and Burges owed to Carmarthen his entry into the House of Commons. "One morning in January, 1787," he tells us, "I received a short letter from Lord Carmarthen desiring me to come up to town immediately to take my seat for the borough of Helston in Cornwall, for which, as he informed me, I had just been returned." \* So were things managed one hundred years ago. So far as these volumes inform us, and so far as we can from other sources learn, neither Carmarthen nor Burges ever set foot in Helston, or even in Cornwall.

One of the principal subjects brought forward in Parliament in 1787 was Pitt's Commercial Treaty with France, of which we know the Foreign Secretary had nothing to do except signing Pitt's despatches when they were put before him. In the common course of business it was his duty to introduce into the House of Lords the Bill to carry the treaty into effect, and he expected to have to perform that task. As ignorant of political economy as Fox, he applied to Burges, his informal adviser, "to cram him," to use a modern phrase, for the occasion. Burges consented, and "drew up a memoir, which his noble friend quickly mastered." What happened must be told in Burges's own words:—

When the eventful day arrived, and while all eyes were turned upon Lord Carmarthen, up rose the identical Lord Temple who had fled from his post in 1783, and, with a becoming apology for his boldness and insufficiency, proceeded to open the Bill, and detail the particulars of the Commercial Treaty. Enraged beyond expression at so unexpected a termination of my labours, and fearful that I should not be able to command either my temper or my countenance if I remained there any longer, I hastily quitted the House, and did not go near his lordship [Carmarthen] for some days. At last I received a very kind note from him, requesting me to call upon him at the Foreign Office. When I entered his room he said, "I see by your looks that you are angry with me, and I can't wonder at it. It was, to be sure, a damned piece of business, but I could not help it. The day before the Bill was to be brought into our House, Pitt told me that, as he was aware it was a matter out of my line, and one on which I had not bestowed particular attention, he had wished to relieve me of it, and had therefore arranged with the Marquis of Buckingham (for that was now Lord Temple's title) for him to open the Bill." "And pray," said I, "why did you not tell him you could do it yourself?" "For the best reason in the world," he replied, with a smile. "From all he knew of the matter he was perfectly founded in his conjecture, and I had neither the presence of mind nor the assurance to tell him what a change had been wrought in me, and so the matter passed without

---

\* "Papers," p. 79.

any more speaking about it, and so let it pass between us; and come and meet some pleasant people at my house at dinner to-day;" and so that squall blew over.\*

A greater slight could not be put by a Premier on a colleague, and Pitt's venturing to take such a liberty with Carmarthen shows that he thought poorly alike of Carmarthen's ability and of his spirit. Although the impeachment of Warren Hastings must have come before the Cabinet while Carmarthen was a member of it, we find no reference to it in his "Memoranda," but in the "Burgess Papers" we find further particulars on the subject of Pitt's tergiversation in Hastings' case. Burgess, on entering Parliament, warmly espoused the cause of the "Great Proconsul," and, when the Begum charge was to be brought forward, resolved to speak on his behalf. He informed Pitt of his intention. What happened he shall relate in his own words:—

On the evening when the charge was brought forward, on Mr. Pitt's entering the House, he took me behind the Speaker's chair, where he suggested several new hints. The effect produced by Sheridan's opening of the charge gave me but small hopes of being much attended to, and of course I felt not disposed to rise, but Mr. Pitt, immediately behind whom I was sitting, urged me so strongly to get up that I at last complied with his wishes. I soon, however, found that the effervescence of the House was too great to admit of any calm attention to my arguments; so, whispering to Mr. Pitt that I would leave the remainder of what I had to say to him, I sat down, and the debate, on his suggestion, was adjourned to the following day.†

For a member in his first session to undertake to reply to a leader is always bold. For him to attempt to reply to perhaps the most memorable speech ever made in the House of Commons was chivalrous, we may say Quixotic. The editor of the "Burgess Papers" is angry with Sir Gilbert Elliot ‡ for saying that Burgess talked "absolute nonsense," and he condemns Burke as "characteristically insolent" for referring to the young member's self-possession—that is to say, effrontery—"while older men were quivering with emotion under the spell of the enchanter." The authorities to which the editor refers show that the speech was an utter failure,§ and that Burgess was, as Macaulay says, in his account of the debate, of Hastings' friends generally, "coughed and scraped down." ||

---

\* "Papers," pp. 78, 79. Temple was not even in the Ministry. It will be remembered he was Pitt's uncle.

† "Burgess Papers," pp. 81, 82.

§ "Papers," pp. 83, 84.

‡ Afterwards the first Earl Minto.  
|| *Vide* essay on Warren Hastings.

Burges relates that the next day he placed himself "in a snug corner on one of the Opposition benches, just facing the Treasury bench," to see, as he thought, Pitt demolish Sheridan, but, "In due time Pitt arose, but what was the astonishment of the House, and above all of myself, when, with a steady countenance and sonorous voice, he poured forth an invective against the unfortunate Hastings so energetic and so acrimonious as precluded all hope of further support or assistance from him against the formidable host by whom that persecuted gentleman was assailed." What follows strikingly illustrates Burges' pert self-sufficiency and Pitt's haughty and contemptuous demeanour towards his supporters, especially if, as in this case, they showed a mutinous tendency. Burges, sitting for Helston as Carmarthen's member, was of course expected to support the Government whenever his vote was required.

The question was put, and pronounced by the Speaker to have been carried, when I started up and demanded a division—from what motive, or with what hope, I can now no more say than I probably could then, unless it were that no other mode of venting the mingled feelings of indignation and contempt which were working within me immediately presented itself. Few unpremeditated enterprises, however, succeeded better than this one, so unexpectedly hazarded under the most forbidding circumstances.\* The question indeed was carried by a great majority (175 to 68), but those who were against were almost entirely of those who, till then, had implicitly voted with the Minister. This was not only mortifying to Mr. Pitt, but was highly encouraging to Mr. Hastings and his steadfast friends. That the impression made upon Mr. Pitt's acute and sensitive mind was strong and unpleasant I had an early proof. When the House broke up, he said to me, with an austere look, "So, sir, you have thought proper to divide the House; I hope you are satisfied." "Perfectly so, sir," I replied. "Then you seem satisfied very easily." "Not exactly so, sir; I am satisfied with nothing that has passed this evening, except the discovery I have made that there were still honest men present." On that, with a stern look and a stately air, he left me.\*

We know nothing which equals Burges' impertinence to Pitt, except that of Madame d'Arblay, during the trial of Hastings, to Burke and Windham.†

Burges says elsewhere—

That Pitt's subsequent reflections upon this affair were not pleasant I have good reason to believe, and that he shrank with a singular

\* "Burges Papers," pp. 84, 85.

† See Madame d'Arblay's own account in her "Diary" for 1789, and Macaulay's comments on it in his essay on Madame d'Arblay.

degree of soreness from even the most distant allusion to it I had an opportunity of witnessing. Some time after he had made common cause with Mr. Hastings' prosecutors, I happened to meet him at Lord Carmarthen's. The conversation after dinner chancing to turn on this unlucky subject, a considerable variety of opinions was expressed by the company. An accidental allusion being made to his unexpected change of sentiments respecting the Begum charge, Pitt, suddenly rising from his chair, and striding to the fire-place, remarked in a dignified tone to Lord Carmarthen, "We have had enough of this subject, my lord; I will thank you to call another." "With all my heart," said Lord Carmarthen; "I am as sick of the subject as you can be; so come, Pitt, sit down and pass the bottle round, for, strange to tell, it stands by you."\*

Burges was a warm partisan and strenuous "advocate of Hastings, and refused," says his editor, "to see any spots upon the brilliancy of his character and career."† His opinions on Hastings and Hastings' adversaries are no doubt biassed, but his position as a member of Parliament, an acquaintance of Pitt, a member of his Administration, and the intimate friend and adviser of his colleague, Carmarthen, gave him means of knowledge which give weight to his statements as to matters of fact. He held with full internal and absolute assent and consent the belief to which Macaulay seems to have inclined, and from which Sir G. Cornwall Lewis dissented—that Pitt was influenced by Dundas; that they both feared that Hastings, created a peer and placed at the Board of Control, would soon draw to himself the management of Eastern affairs, and might even become a formidable rival in the Cabinet.‡ They knew that he stood high in the King's favour, that the Chancellor was ready, without Pitt's assent, to put the Great Seal to Hastings' patent of peerage, and, they also knew, as Macaulay points out, that "if the Commons impeached Hastings all danger was at an end. The proceeding, however it might terminate, would last some years. In the meantime, the accused person would be excluded from honours and public employments, and could scarcely venture even to pay his duty at Court. Such were the motives attributed by a great part of the public to the

---

\* "Burges Papers," p. 90. "William Pitt was not often chargeable with stopping the bottle."—Editor's note on p. 90.

† "Burges Papers," p. 85.

‡ See Macaulay's essay on Warren Hastings. We understand Macaulay not dogmatically to affirm that Pitt was influenced by such motives, but merely to state that such was the opinion of many. Sir G. Cornwall Lewis's views on the question will be found in his "Administrations of Great Britain," pp. 102 *et seq.* and 168. Burges' reasons for holding his belief are fully stated in his "Papers," pp. 85-92.

young Minister, whose ruling passion was generally believed to be avarice of power." \* Burges gives his own testimony as to Dundas's frank and cynical avowal that such were Pitt's motives and his own. This story was first made known by a letter of Lord Bulkeley to Lord Buckingham, published in the Buckingham papers, and quoted by Lord Russell and by Sir G. Cornwall Lewis.†

As I was present on the occasion [says Burges] I can vouch for the perfect authenticity of the incident. Lord Maitland, one of the managers, came up to Mr. Dundas in the House of Commons, and asked his opinion on some point respecting the impeachment. Dundas declined to give any; Lord Maitland urged him strongly, and said, "You cannot be indifferent about our success." "Troth am I," answered Dundas, "ye hae done a' we wanted, and I shall gie myself nae trouble aboot what comes o' ye." "Will you say so to any one else?" Lord Maitland asked. "Troth shall I," replied the other. On that Lord Maitland called aside Fitzpatrick and Sheridan, also managers, to whom, without shame or scruple, Dundas repeated what he had just said.‡

Dundas's words, as given by Lord Bulkeley, were, "You and your friends of the Opposition have done our business by keeping him out of the Board of Control." Bulkeley reported what he had heard from others. Burges was present, and tells us what he saw and heard. There are other minor discrepancies in the two versions, but, as Bulkeley says, "the fact is certain."

After the division on the Begum charge, Pitt's "coldness of demeanour" to Burges "became exasperating." It would seem as if Pitt complained to Carmarthen of Burges' using a Government seat to vote against the Government. Carmarthen's views of his relations with his members appear in his correspondence with Mr. Abbot,§ who succeeded Burges as one of his nominees for Helston. "It certainly must be highly desirable," he writes to Abbot, "to every person that the political sentiments of their parliamentary friends should correspond with their own, otherwise I do not see of what use parliamentary interest can be; and surely there might be found many objects more worth the trouble and expense of procuring such interests if affording no influence over the conduct of friends of that description." || Carmarthen, however, did not make mere voting-machines of his nominees. Burges sought an interview with him, at which he "was con-

\* "Life of Fox," vol. ii. p. 154. + "Administrations," &c., p. 103.

† "Burges Papers," p. 91.

§ Afterwards Speaker of the House of Commons and Lord Colchester.

|| "Diary of Lord Colchester," vol. i. p. 127.

fidential as well as communicative," and his member departed, "much relieved of mind, and with all bitterness of feeling mitigated, if not removed." Once again the patron and the nominee differed. Burges voted against the slave trade, and Carmarthen "plainly intimated his wish that he should cease from troubling the merchants of Liverpool and Bristol." Burges firmly declined to vote against his conscience. Carmarthen then gave him *carte blanche* to act in accordance with his convictions, and a few weeks afterwards, Burges, through Carmarthen's influence, was made Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs. He now renewed his amicable relations with Pitt, who once more treated him in the most friendly and confidential manner.\*

Carmarthen relates fully the proceedings of the Cabinet in 1789 as to the King's insanity and its consequence, a Regency, but we learn from his "Memoranda" little of novelty or importance. We observe that he confirms Sir G. Cornwall Lewis's opinion, that Lord Campbell was mistaken in supposing that Thurlow's treachery to his colleagues was first revealed by the well-known incident of the hat.† Early in the crisis, "The Duke of Richmond observed we must have an explanation from the Chancellor what he meant to do. Mr. Pitt said such an explanation was absolutely necessary, as the Chancellor's conduct seemed very extraordinary indeed. . . . They both seemed to think that the Chancellor was acting a double part, and that provided he was suffered to keep his place he could easily be prevailed upon to accede to such mode of government as the strongest interest might choose to establish."‡ We also learn Camden's opinion, of Thurlow, and no one had better opportunities of forming an opinion of him. He said—

Thurlow was an odd man—that he had flattered the King about power, and recommended corruption as necessary to carry on government . . . adding that his "wonderful parliamentary talents were the cause of his being so much courted, that in other particulars he was not without superiors, that he had little judgment and no decision, which latter failing was much felt in the Court of Chancery. Lord Stafford and Lord Weymouth were the only two people who had weight with him, and of both those persons he was afraid. He was well with the King because he had supported the American war, and had never forfeited his Majesty's esteem by joining Mr. Fox and his party, as Lord North and others had done. His lordship observed that the reason of the King's dislike to Eden§ and Dundas was the

\* "Burges Papers," pp. 108, 130. † "Administrations," &c., p. 122, note.

‡ "Memoranda," p. 130, and see pp. 131, 133.

§ Afterwards Lord Auckland, described by Burges ("Papers," p. 77) as "essentially a time-server and egregiously selfish." He is called in the "Rolliad" "Billy Eden, the renegade scout."

latter having deserted Lord North before the coalition took place, and the former having been the instrument of continuing that coalition; that the only people for whom the King had any regard were those who had formerly supported Lord North to the end of his Administration, and who had not joined the coalition; that as for any of us his Majesty cared not a farthing. He expressed his concern at the Chancellor's having obtained the Queen's confidence, as he would certainly bring about a reconciliation with the Prince, though at the expense of sacrificing the King and everybody else; in short, my lord, he is a bad man."\*

Every one remembers Thurlow's profane profession of allegiance to George III., and it is amusing to read that he cynically told Carmarthen "there was no probability of the King's recovery, and that for the quiet of the country the melancholy circumstance of his death might not be a very unfortunate event." With the "Memoranda," for the first time so far as we know, are published Pitt's letter to the Prince of Wales,† informing him of the Ministerial plan of a Regency, and the Prince's reply.‡ They are both too long for insertion here. The reply is well described by Carmarthen "as upon the whole a strange performance, and by no means an able one; now and then there appeared something of Sheridan's language, and still more of Lord Loughborough's, though very far from being in either of their best manners."§

Burges in his notice of this time relates two *bon mots* of Carmarthen's which illustrate "the ready wit and wonderful faculty of expression" which he attributed to him. Referring to Fox's hasty assertion of the Prince's absolute right to the Regency, some one asked Carmarthen how Fox came to let the cat out of the bag so soon. Carmarthen, referring to certain members, supporters of the Government, who on this occasion went with the Opposition, promptly replied: "To catch the rats, I suppose." Another person asked him if it were true that Fox was suffering from a stomach complaint; Carmarthen, referring to Fox's attempt to explain away his injudicious assertion, replied: "It is very likely. He has been eating his own words, and they must have disagreed with him."|| There was little of confidence or communication, but much of plotting and underhand intrigue, among the members of Pitt's Cabinet. Early in 1791 communication between Pitt and Leeds seems to have ceased, and a plot began for the removal of the Duke of Leeds, as he had then become, from the Foreign Office. On Friday, March 4, he records:—

Burges called upon me in the evening, and mentioned a report which he had heard; that, besides Dundas being appointed Secretary

\* "Memoranda," pp. 139, 140.

† *Ibid.* p. 143.

‡ *Ibid.* Introduction, p. vi.

§ *Ibid.* p. 183; *conf.* Fitzgerald's "Life of George IV." vol. i. p. 163.

|| "Papers," pp. 115, 116, notes.

of State for India, it was supposed to be in contemplation to make Lord Auckland Secretary of State for the Home Department, Lord Grenville to take that for Foreign Affairs;\* that Mr. Pitt, Lord Grenville, the Duke of Montrose, and Dundas were daily closeted together for hours at a time. Nothing had transpired respecting the mode in which the Foreign Department was to be vacated, whether I was to be dismissed, driven to resign, or any arrangement proposed to me.†

The Duke applied to the Chancellor "desiring to know if he had heard anything of the report." Thurlow told him

he had heard such reports, but that the Duke of Montrose had been mentioned to him as likely to succeed to the Foreign Department, and that he himself was in a situation similar to, if not worse, than mine, as to a want of communication on the part of other Ministers; ‡ that he hardly knew whom he could look upon as his colleagues, unless those who with him happened to attend the Hanging Cabinets.§

Afterwards the Chancellor said "he was convinced they meant to get rid of him when their minds should be made up respecting his successor." The Chancellor's conviction was right, though he kept the seals two years longer. His successor, Loughborough, seems to have been concerned in the intrigue, as Lord Thurlow named Loughborough "as the person who had told him of the Duke of Montrose being supposed to be thought of for the new Secretary of State."|| Events favoured the plotters and enabled the Duke honourably to retire from office. The ever-recurring Eastern Question was then in one of its many phases. Austria and Russia had been at war with Turkey. Austria had made peace, but Russia refused to cease from hostilities unless she was allowed to keep the fortress of Ocsakow, situated at the mouth of the Dnieper, which at the cost of many lives she had wrested from the Turks. England and her allies, Prussia and Holland, insisted Russia should yield up this fort to the Turks, and on her refusal the Cabinet proposed to send a Prussian army into Livonia, an English fleet into the Baltic, and a squadron into the Black Sea. A message from the Crown on the subject was brought down to both Houses, and addresses in favour of the Ministerial policy brought forward in each House. The Opposition stoutly opposed the employment of English ships in a quarrel so remote from

\* Mr. W. Grenville left the Speaker's chair in 1789 to succeed Lord Sydney at the Home Office, and was then made Lord Grenville.

† "Memoranda," p. 148.

‡ A like complaint was made by the Duke of Richmond; *vide* p. 156.

§ "Memoranda," p. 149. "Cabinet Councils held for the purpose of determining who of the numerous prisoners condemned to death should be actually hung."—Editor's note.

|| "Memoranda," p. 150.



English interests. Fox, in words which are as applicable to the events of to-day as to those of the time at which he spoke, denounced "those involved and mysterious politics which make it incumbent upon us, nay, which prove its perfection, by compelling us to stand forward the principals in every quarrel, the Quixotes of every enterprise, the agitators in every plot, intrigue, and disturbance which are every day arising in Europe to embroil one State of it with another."\* The Ministry had parliamentary majorities, but Pitt knew and felt that the Opposition had the country with them. The Opposition also had a representative in the Cabinet in Grenville, who by this time appeared to Burges to be "at least equal in political importance to Pitt, who gave way to him in a manner very extraordinary, especially in one of his character." Grenville's ideas on foreign policy were akin to those of Fox. His dislike, says Burges, "to the contemplated war with Russia was only part of his deliberate aversion from all interference with Continental affairs."† The Duke of Leeds narrates at length the vacillations of the Cabinet. The Duke of Richmond first suggested that the Ministers ought to look out for some expedient to get out of their scrape. Lords Stafford and Grenville were of the same opinion. To Leeds it seemed difficult to retract with honour or anything like consistency; he so spoke to Pitt, who said "he perfectly agreed with him, and said his opinion as well as Leeds' remained perfectly unchanged." On Leeds suggesting he might feel called on to resign, Pitt said "he perfectly agreed with him in sentiment even to the point of resignation, but begged him to reflect on the consequences which breaking up the Government might produce to the country in general and to the King in particular."‡ The subject was discussed at many Cabinets. At one meeting the Chancellor either actually was or appeared to be asleep the greater part of the time. ("This," says Leeds, "I own I thought extraordinary, unless he counterfeited sleep in order to avoid taking any part in the conversation, which was warmly carried on, though with good temper, and in which his friend Lord Stafford's sentiments did not appear to coincide with his own." §)

On April 4 we find this note: "Mr. Pitt called upon me at the Office, stated his opinion still being the same with mine ;

---

\* These words were actually spoken on March 1, 1792, in Fox's celebrated speech on the Russian armament, but they state the ground on which the Opposition acted.

† "Papers," pp. 149, 172. Burges was then Under-Secretary at the Foreign Office.

‡ "Memoranda," p. 154.

§ *Ibid.* p. 157.

‘lamenting, however, the prospect of not being supported cordially by Parliament or people,’ he reverted to the question, ‘What would become of the King’ were the Government to break up?’

On the 9th, Leeds received from Pitt “the draft of a despatch intended for Berlin, drawn evidently with a view to counteract our former plan.” This he was expected to adopt and sign as if he had been an automaton. The next day there was a Cabinet.

Previous to its meeting Mr. Pitt came to me [Leeds records], and we had some conversation on the subject of the despatches he had sent me the previous evening. . . . He continued that his sentiments still remained the same, but that he felt an absolute necessity of sacrificing his opinion to the difficulties that presented themselves; we went to the Cabinet, when, finding how things must now finally go, I took little, if any, share in their deliberations. The despatches were approved by the rest of the members.\*

Leeds knew that Pitt was anxious to get rid of him, and felt he could not with any self-respect continue at the Foreign Office merely to sign despatches one day announcing a policy, on another its repudiation, though he himself disapproved of the change. He therefore sought an interview with the King, and announced his wish to resign the seals. “The King,” he says, “appeared both surprised and concerned, but, having attentively listened to my explanation, could not but approve my conduct, although in the kindest manner he repeated his concern at the measure I was about to adopt in consequence of it.”† On this occasion, as on many others, the sincerity of his Majesty’s professions is doubtful. It is strange that Leeds did not resign at once, but he continued in office until the end of the session. He still attended Cabinets, and was expected to sign despatches and instructions of which he disapproved. He refused to sign the instructions to the British Minister at Berlin retracting England’s prior engagements with the King of Prussia, on which the King granted permission to Lord Grenville to sign the despatches of the Foreign Office.‡ His account of what passed at one of the last Cabinets he attended is amusing: The Duke of Richmond having expressed a hope that the retracting despatch had arrived at Berlin,

The Chancellor said he hoped not, and thought there had been a fortunate east wind which would prevent the second messenger from arriving. The Duke seemed nettled at this answer, and replied, “I suppose, then, you want to read Homer, my lord.” “What the devil,” retorted the Chancellor, “has Homer to do with this business?”

\* “Memoranda,” pp. 160, 161.

† *Ibid.* p. 163.

‡ *Ibid.* pp. 166–67; *conf.* Lord Colchester’s “Diary,” vol. i. p. 28.

"Only," replied the Duke, "I suppose your lordship may want to have sufficient leisure to read Homer in comfort, which, from your situation, you have not at present." After a little more snarling on one part, and a great deal of grumbling on the other, the dialogue concluded. The Duke of Richmond then asked me if I recollected the day the second messenger went. I told him he set out on Fryday, April 1st. Pitt could not help saying, "Now, do own, Duke, that you enjoy the date on this occasion." I told him I really answered the Duke *tout bonnement*, and was sure the date was accurate; however, since he mentioned it, I could not say I was particularly sorry at such a step being taken on such a day.\*

Thurlow agreed with Leeds on the question which led to Leeds' resignation. "He was very cross and sullen," and said to Burges, "I do not believe that there can be any danger of war while the present Ministers continue in place; what can they go to war for? We have given up everything for which a war could be commenced, and, after swallowing *this disgrace*, what other disgrace can we scruple to swallow?" On which Leeds makes this comment: "Such being his lordship's sentiments, it seems we are much nearer agreeing in theory than practice." On April 21 "Leeds delivered the seals up into his Majesty's hands; the King said he was very sorry to receive them from me, adding a great many flattering expressions of regard and approbation."† Leeds was succeeded by the peace-loving Grenville, and in the end Russia was allowed to keep Ocsakow.‡ Grenville, in his correspondence, implies that Leeds' resignation arose from private motives which the Duke did not wish generally known,§ but the ground of his resignation was beyond doubt the change in the Ministerial policy.

Leeds was never again in office, but in 1792 he took part in an important negotiation. He was then, like many other people, desirous, on account of the internal disturbances caused by the French Revolution and the probability of a European war, that the country should have a strong Government which should include both Pitt and Fox. In the course of 1792 a negotiation

\* "Memoranda," p. 166. We forget whether it is Thurlow or his predecessor, Northington, who is referred to in these lines in Anstey's "New Bath Guide." They are equally applicable to both Chancellors—

"Lord Ringbone, who lay in his parlour below  
On account of the gout he had got in his toe,  
Began on a sudden to curse and to swear;  
I protest, my dear mother, 'twas shocking to hear  
The oaths of that disreputable gouty old peer."

† "Memoranda," pp. 170, 171, 173. Burges does not mention this speech of Thurlow's.

‡ See the Commons debate of March 1, 1792, especially Fox's speech.

§ See Lord Colchester's "Diary," vol. i. p. 28, note.

was set on foot to bring about this coalition.\* Burges, writing after his quarrel with the Duke, grossly misrepresents the part he took in the negotiation.

I have learned [Burges writes to his wife] a very curious anecdote of the Duke of Leeds, which does great credit to his modesty and good sense. Before the present Ministerial arrangement took place,† and when the negotiation for that purpose was depending, many difficulties, as you will readily believe, arose as to the manner in which it was to be adjusted. The Duke, having heard of this, and conceiving that a favourable opportunity was afforded to him of again coming into power, devised a plan which he submitted to his Cabinet Council, consisting of the Duchess, Dr. Jackson, Sir Ralph Woodford, Mr. Aust, and Mr. Glover,§ and which was approved by them. In consequence of this he drove down to Windsor and requested an audience of the King. After the proper preliminaries and professions of zeal and attachment, he told his Majesty that it appeared to him that, however desirable the depending coalition of parties might be, he was satisfied it could not be effected unless some means could be found to reconcile the jarring pretensions of Mr. Pitt and the Duke of Portland, the latter of whom, having formerly been Prime Minister, and expelled by the former, could never submit to the degrading circumstance of coming into administration while Mr. Pitt continued First Lord of the Treasury. To obviate this barrier, and to render everything easy, the Duke said he had determined to come forward and to propose to his Majesty that he should be named First Lord of the Treasury (in plain English, Prime Minister), that then Mr. Pitt might continue Chancellor of the Exchequer (in plain English, his deputy), in which case he would be answerable to his Majesty that the Duke of Portland would accept of the Secretaryship of State, as, from his (the Duke of Leeds) being the senior duke, no impediments from etiquette would stand in his way. His Grace assured the King he had no other reason for making this proposal but the most sincere wish to save his Majesty from embarrassment, and to serve his country, &c. &c. My information does not go so far as to enable me to state with clearness the answer which was given to all this; nor do I know certainly what passed till about five minutes after the audience was over. When the Duke had made his bow, he came out upon the terrace, and immediately after the King did the like. The Duke joined his suite, and before they had advanced many paces Mr. Pitt came up. He had hardly taken off his hat to make his bow before the King called out to him, "I am sorry I have bad news for you, but you are out." "Out,

\* "Memoranda," p. 177; but see the King's denial, p. 188, and Pitt's, pp. 194, 195.

† The letter is dated October 14, 1794, two years after the events happened.

‡ The junction in 1793 between Pitt and the Duke of Portland, Earl Spencer, Windham, and other Whigs is here referred to.

§ These were the Duke's toad-caters.

“sir?” exclaimed Mr. Pitt, with much surprise. “Yes,” replied the King; “I am sorry to tell you you are out; you are no longer First Lord of the Treasury; but do you know who succeeds you?” “I really do not,” replied Mr. Pitt. “That’s very strange,” said the King; “I should have supposed you might at least have been able to form some idea of who it is; look around you and try if you can discover him.” Mr. Pitt accordingly did so, and then assured his Majesty he had not been able to find him out. “Why,” said the King, “if you can’t guess, I will tell you—it is the Duke of Leeds here, who has this moment offered himself to succeed you as First Lord of the Treasury in order to prevent confusion. I am sure you will agree with me that such an arrangement will be very desirable, as you know the Duke so well, and must have so high an opinion of him.” I leave you to figure to yourself what his Grace’s feelings and countenance were on this occasion. The consequence, however, was a fit of his stomachic complaint, and his being entirely out of the arrangement. You may depend upon the whole of this being literally true; for my authorities are indisputable, as you know when I tell you they are George Brooks and Lady Holderness.\*

We do not know who George Brooks was or what were his means of knowledge, but Lady Holderness was some connection of the Duke’s divorced wife,† and probably had no objection to make him appear in a ridiculous light. However that may be, we will show that the whole of the story, so far from being wholly and literally true, is mostly false. It is true that the Duke had an interview with the King, but it was not in consequence of the advice of his toad-eaters, but it was the result of a conference between him and the Duke of Portland. This conference was sought by Portland, not by Leeds. Both Dukes had one object in view, a coalition between Pitt and Fox. The memorandum for 1792 relates that, in the course of the conference,

the Duke [of Portland] stated a circumstance of difficulty in the arrangement, supposing the plan to be adopted, which was Mr. Pitt remaining at the head of the Treasury, which of course would give him in point of etiquette a nominal superiority over Mr. Fox in the House. His Grace added he did not believe Mr. Pitt would make any difficulty upon this point, as the idea was that he and Mr. Fox should be the two Secretaries of State, and therefore some person of character and unexceptionable to the country at large, and in whom both parties at their outset (meaning hereafter to form one mass) could have confidence, should be appointed First Lord of the Treasury, by which neither of these gentlemen could officially claim a superiority

\* “Papers,” p. 273.

† As the divorced wife was the only daughter and heir of the last Earl of Holderness, the lady mentioned by Burges was probably her mother.

in the Cabinet. To this I made no particular answer, having heard from Sir R. Wd. that the friends of the Duke of Portland had thought of me for that situation. I said the whole matter was deserving of the most serious attention; that I wished to hear of a direct communication between Mr. Pitt and Mr. Fox upon the subject, and above all things that the King's sentiments might be known respecting it.\*

Leeds assured Portland that if he could be of any use in forwarding the communications necessary for the purpose of effecting the desired arrangement either with the King or Pitt, he was perfectly ready to be employed for that purpose. The substance of the conversation between the two Dukes was communicated to Fox,† and Portland in writing authorized Leeds to communicate to the King the substance of what had passed between them. Lord Malmesbury ‡ undertook to be the medium of communication between Leeds and Fox. The memorandum contains this passage:—

Friday, August 3rd.—I received a letter from Lord Malmesbury in which he acquaints me that Mr. Fox had great satisfaction from my idea of seeing the King, as he considered the success of the whole to depend on his Majesty's having an arrangement in his wishes; that he had no objection to my speaking fully and without reserve to Messrs. Pitt and Dundas, but thought it unadvisable for me to communicate with either of them till after I had seen the King. That Mr. Fox repeatedly dwelt on the indispensable necessity of an alteration in the Treasury, and without that was admitted nothing could be done. Lord Malmesbury expresses his fear that this will be an insurmountable obstacle, although if an arrangement takes place with everybody belonging to it in the same mind and acting on the same principle, he still thinks it might be got over.§

It is clear, therefore, that Leeds went to the King, not of his own mere motion, as stated by Burges, but as the representative of Portland, Malmesbury, and Fox. Neither did he abruptly intrude himself on the King. On August 13 he attended the Queen's ball at Windsor; he then and there had a long conversation with the Duke of York, who was favourable to such an arrangement as was contemplated, and suggested that Leeds should at once ask the King for an audience. Leeds took his advice, and the audience was granted the next day. This is his account of what passed:—

I mentioned to his Majesty the interview I had had with the Duke of Portland at his Grace's desire, and stated the general substance of

---

\* "Memoranda," pp. 178–79. Sir R. Wd. is Sir Ralph Woodford.

† "Memoranda," p. 179.

‡ The first Earl of Malmesbury.

§ "Memoranda," p. 183. In a note the editor states that this letter is printed in the "Malmesbury Correspondence," p. 483. He also refers to an entry in Lord Malmesbury's "Diary" for July 30 (p. 472), and adds, "Evidently Fox was not sanguine about any arrangement being possible."

the conversation that had passed between us. I told the King I thought it expedient to have something more than verbal authority from the Duke to make the communication to his Majesty, for which purpose I had written to the Duke. I then showed my letter and the Duke's answer. The answer was so proper in every point of view, and so respectful to the King, I flattered myself it might create a favourable impression on his mind towards the Duke of Portland. I told his Majesty that though I had not seen Mr. Fox I was fully authorized to declare his concurrence in everything the Duke of Portland had stated to me. I likewise mentioned the queries I had sent to Mr. Fox by Lord Malmesbury, with Mr. Fox's opinion that it would be improper to communicate the business to Mr. Pitt or Mr. Dundas until his Majesty himself had been acquainted with it. This I endeavoured to turn to Mr. Fox's advantage, as a mark of proper respect towards his Majesty. Whether it had any effect I am ignorant, for his Majesty did not, I believe, mention Mr. Fox's name more than once, if even that, during the whole conversation. I mentioned the several interviews which had passed between Lord Loughborough and Mr. Dundas, at one at least of which Mr. Pitt had been present (and which had been mentioned in the newspapers), as affording sufficient reason to suppose his Majesty's servants not indisposed to an arrangement, and that I took for granted his Majesty was informed of everything that had passed down to the present time. To my great surprise the King answered that he had not heard anything upon the subject for a long time. That Mr. Pitt had indeed some months ago mentioned something like an opening on the part of the Duke of Portland and his friends, to which his Majesty had answered, 'Anything complimentary to them, but no power'!! [The first part of this brief but pretty copious answer explains the circumstance of the offer of the Garter to the Duke of Portland and of the Marquisate of Rockingham to Lord Fitzwilliam, and the latter proves but too clearly the great difficulty, if not impossibility, of succeeding in the proposed arrangement!]

His Majesty informed me he had been talked to on the subject of the Duke of Portland by Lord Bute (probably in the audience he had to deliver up his father's ribband), who is connected with his Grace, and who was full of expressions of the Duke's good intentions and dutiful attachment to his Majesty. The King very truly observed that it frequently happened that people, from eagerly wishing an object to succeed, deceived themselves by thinking it much nearer its accomplishment than in truth it was. That in the year 1780, during the riots, the Administration had made some approaches towards Lord Rockingham and the Duke of Portland which seemed calculated to effectuate a union of parties. That this was done not only without any authority from his Majesty, but even without his knowledge, nor was he informed of it till a long time afterwards. With regard to the change in the Treasury mentioned in the Duke of Portland's letter, his Majesty thought it impossible either Mr. Pitt or his friends could consent to it. I observed that some of the Duke of Portland's friends—viz., Lord Carlisle and Lord Loughborough—did not think it necessary, and that I believed it was not meant by any that Mr. Pitt

should not still remain Minister of the Finances, that this might be managed by his continuing Chancellor of the Exchequer although appointed Secretary of State. The King asked me who was proposed to be First Lord of the Treasury. I answered that I could not tell, but that it was meant that some one should be in that situation who was upon terms of friendship and confidence with both parties. His Majesty replied it would be very awkward for Mr. Pitt, after having been so long at the head of that Board, to descend to an inferior situation at it, and that whoever was the First Lord must either be a cypher or Mr. Pitt appear as a *commis*. . . . His Majesty did me the honour to say he should always consider himself as obliged to me for the communication I had made to him, and immediately returned to the Queen and royal family at the Castle. I ought to have mentioned the King having said he could only thank the Duke of Portland for his good intentions.\*

Burges' version of this audience is therefore a lie with a circumstance. The Duke's memorandum was written at the time, and plainly it contains neither *suppressio veri* or *suggestio falsi*.† The walk on the terrace, where the scene between the King, the Duke, and the Premier is said to have taken place, is a mere invention. Pitt was not at Windsor on that day, for Leeds relates that, in a conversation which he had with Pitt on the subject of the audience with the King, "Mr. Pitt told me the King had mentioned to him the conversation I had had with his Majesty at Windsor the following day at St. James's."‡

In this conversation Pitt, as we think naturally and rightly, "owned he could have wished a business in which he himself was so materially and immediately concerned had been mentioned to him first, although he was convinced the mode in which it had been conducted was founded in motives of the purest and honourable delicacy." Being pressed by Leeds to see Portland, "Pitt answered he thought it could answer no purpose whatever, as he had in truth nothing to say upon anything approaching to the idea of an alteration of the present Government."§

Burges narrates a long gossip with George III. in 1793, in which his Majesty openly expressed his dislike of and contempt for Leeds, and held him up to ridicule, but made no mention of the alleged scene at Windsor.|| This further discredits Burges. When the coalition of the Whigs with Pitt was arranged in 1793 no place was found for Leeds; we think it probable Pitt bore him a grudge for his entering into a negotiation unknown to Pitt for the purpose of displacing him as head of the Government. Lord Malmesbury says of Leeds' conduct in this matter,

\* "Memoranda," pp. 187-8-9.

† At end of quotation, "Memoranda," pp. 187-8-9. ‡ *Ibid.* p. 195.

§ *Ibid.* p. 196. || See the "Burges Papers," pp. 302, 303.



"The Duke of Leeds was in earnest," and then expresses the opinion we have before cited, "but he is always, carried away more by his imagination and sanguine hopes; in which his string of toad-eaters encourage him, than by reason and reflection." \*

The editor of the "Memoranda" describes the Duke of Leeds as A statesman of the Ciceronian type. He represents a time when the business of the country was conducted by the members of a few privileged families, who, conscious of their position and of their duties, trained themselves carefully for their high behest, and considered that each action of their lives should reflect the magnanimity which properly belonged to so lofty a vocation ;

and elsewhere he speaks of the "aristocratical régime, which the modern Democracy will find it difficult to surpass."†

The early part of George III.'s reign certainly exemplified Hosea Biglow's lines—

'Tis something like a fulfilling of the prophecies,  
When all the first families fill all the first offices.

But we see no proof that the privileged families carefully trained themselves for their great duties, nor of their constant magnanimity. Take, for instance, the Prime Ministers of that time. Bute was said to be only fit to be Chamberlain at a small German Court. In his short career there was no evidence of this careful training. His conduct in the proscription of the followers of Newcastle and Pitt was the reverse of magnanimous. George Grenville's policy with regard to America, general warrants, and Wilks, shows as little of trained statesmanship as of magnanimity. Of Grafton we have already spoken. The great Earl of Chatham was not one of the privileged families, and he was an eccentric genius. Lord North made himself the tool of the King, in whose prejudice and passion there was as little statesmanship as magnanimity. We have the greatest respect for the memory of Lord Rockingham, but we do not see in him the qualities which our editor attributes to the privileged classes. Lord Shelburne was the first of George III.'s Premiers who can lay any claim to be a political scholar.

The second Pitt no more than his father belonged to the privileged families. While at Cambridge he laid the foundations of a sound political education, which his early entry into office prevented his carrying on. Neither he nor Shelburne were remarkable for magnanimity. We therefore think that modern Democracy will not find it difficult to surpass the statesmanship of the privileged class, of which the fifth Duke of Leeds was a member and a fair example.

\* Quoted from Lord Malmesbury's "Diaries" by the editor of the "Memoranda," in a note on p. 182.

† "Memoranda," Introduction, pp. iv. xi.

## ART. VI.—A WESTMINSTER ELECTION A CENTURY AGO.

**A**T a time when two millions of persons hitherto unenfranchised have been added to the number of voters and are about to take their share in the government of the nation, it may not be altogether inappropriate to describe the proceedings in an election of a century ago ; and for this purpose, with abundant material at our disposal, we have selected the Westminster election which commenced on April 1 and was decided on May 17, 1784, at the General Election which took place in consequence of the rejection of Pitt's East India Bill and the downfall of the Portland Administration. The occurrences recorded are in marked contrast with modern electioneering practices, and a description of them can indeed be given only very inadequately within the limits assigned to this article ; those occurrences will seem singular and curious, often indeed whimsical and ridiculous, to the sober-minded and practical men of the present day. Many of the electioneering "squibs," artistic and literary, are grossly personal, and not a few of them too indecent to be reproduced here. The scandal and abuse which were poured out to defame those ladies of fashion who interested themselves in this election, and most especially the distinguished patroness of Mr. Fox's cause and party—the Duchess of Devonshire—provoked long ago the execration of the public ; but one wonders that such filthy and libellous charges should ever have been tolerated, and that the protection of the law was not sought for on her Grace's behalf.

As evidence of the marvellous progress made during this century, and of the reform which is the result of such progress, we may mention that a century ago it took seven weeks to poll Westminster, while to-day the most populous city or borough in the United Kingdom has but one day appointed to decide the issue of a contested election. This no doubt is due to the progress made in traffic, the formation of railways, the improved means of communication, the Ballot Act, and the diminution of corruption. Then a great deal depended on which candidate had the most money to spend ; for bribery was used extensively on both sides ; now the law on this point is so stringent, and will be even more so under the Corrupt Practices Act, that a candidate runs the utmost risk not only of being unseated on a single case of bribery proved against him, but of being imprisoned.

The facts which led to the General Election of 1784 are briefly these. On December 9, 1783, a petition was presented to the House of Lords by the East India Company, praying to

be heard against the East India Bill, when, on the motion for adjournment made by the Duke of Chandos, the Duke of Portland was defeated by a majority of eight; and a week later, when the order for committing the Bill was read, it was lost by a majority of nineteen. On January 15, 1784, Mr. Pitt in the House of Commons proposed his new India Bill: the House then resolved itself into a Committee on the state of the nation, and a motion, made by Lord C. Spencer and seconded by Mr. Baker, which was tantamount to an expression of want of confidence in the Administration, was carried by a majority of twenty-one. On January 23, Mr. Pitt moved "that the India Bill be read a second time," and the motion was agreed to. On the question being put, that the Bill be committed, the House divided, when there was a majority of eight for throwing it out. In consequence of this defeat a meeting was held at the St. Alban's Tavern for the purpose of forming a coalition Ministry. Mr. Pitt refused the advice of this "respectable company," and a motion was made and carried in the House of Commons, "that the continuance of the present Ministry in power is an obstacle to the formation of such an Administration as is likely to have the confidence of this House and the people." Many adverse votes having been given against Mr. Pitt, the House was prorogued on March 24; and, on the day following, the King issued a proclamation dissolving the existing Parliament and ordering the election of its successor.

Previous to the dissolution, Sir Cecil Wray, who was returned with Mr. Fox on the previous occasion, presented an humble address to his Majesty, said to contain the sentiments of the Dean and burgesses of Westminster, and expressing confidence in Mr. Pitt's Administration. Immediately the King's proclamation was issued, Sir Cecil was asked to attend at the Shakespeare Tavern to explain his conduct in this matter; and, as the company seemed not to relish the part he had taken, and expressed their disapprobation in not the most polite manner, he left the room, and convened a meeting of his supporters on February 10, 1784, in the Court of Requests in Westminster Hall. The accounts of this meeting are very conflicting. It was asserted by those papers which supported Sir Cecil Wray, who was already estranged from Mr. Fox, that the following resolution was passed unanimously:—"That the cordial thanks of this meeting be given to Sir Cecil Wray, Bart., our worthy representative, for his steady, uniform, upright, and patriotic conduct in Parliament; and that he be requested to present the address of the electors to his Majesty." On the other hand, it was alleged that Mr. Fox's friends, indignant at the conduct of Sir Cecil Wray, attended the above meeting, and having hissed down every speaker who rose

to address the assembly—including Lord Mahon, Lord Mountmorres, and Sir Cecil Wray himself—broke up the meeting and very nearly created a serious riot. In opposition to this meeting Mr. Fox called together an assembly at the King's Arms Tavern, Palace Yard, where there were present, "among other noblemen and gentlemen and respectable electors," Mr. Fox, Mr. Byng, Mr. Berke, Mr. Sheridan, General Burgoyne, Lord Derby, Lord Surrey, Lord Foley, and Colonel Fitzpatrick.

Both meetings were convened in consequence of advertisements for calling together all the electors of the city and liberty of Westminster, to collect the sense of the electors respecting an humble address to be presented to his Majesty on the state of public affairs: Sir Cecil Wray and his friends supported the existing Administration, and Mr. Fox's party opposed it. On this occasion the hall was crowded, and at half-past eleven Sir Cecil Wray and his party came from Alice's Coffee-house to the hustings, erected in the Court of Common Pleas; soon afterwards Mr. Fox and his friends came from the King's Arms Tavern, whereby "the hustings were crowded in such a manner that made it almost impossible to stand on them." The chair was surrounded by Sir Cecil Wray's party, and soon laid hold of, in consequence of which Mr. Fox's friends interfered and claimed the chair till a chairman was nominated, and in this struggle the chair was completely demolished. The confusion and uproar thus occasioned was very great. According to the chronicle, the hustings broke down, and several noblemen and gentlemen were thrown down and trampled on. The pressure of the populace soon overthrew the front of the hustings, so that scarcely a place was for the moment tenable, and everybody was in imminent danger in this contest as to which member should be brought forward; but Mr. Fox's friends being most numerous, he was supported to the front amidst the most violent noises, acclamations, and huzzas. While the cry of "Chair! Chair! Chair!" resounded from every quarter of the hall, the hustings gave way a second time, and, in the confusion, Mr. Fox fell. In this situation some one is reported to have thrown a leather bag filled with euphorbium in the face of Mr. Fox. At last Mr. Byron, the committee chairman, endeavoured to appease the tumult and silence the noise. He shortly addressed the electors, telling them the purport of the meeting, and directing them to express their wishes by a show of hands. Hats were held up, accompanied with vociferous shouts of approbation, and the majority in favour of Mr. Fox was so very conspicuous as not to leave the least doubt. Mr. Fox then endeavoured to address the electors, but noise immediately prevented him, and, though he attempted several times

to speak, he was unsuccessful in gaining a hearing. At half-past twelve the meeting was adjourned, and Mr. Fox was carried on the shoulders of several electors to the King's Arms Tavern, almost overpowered with heat and fatigue. Soon afterwards he came forward to the front window of the tavern, and, after being greeted by loud and prolonged shouts of approbation, addressed the electors in a vigorous speech which completely satisfied them.

On February 28 Mr. Pitt made his public entry into the City. The committee appointed to present the thanks of the Court set out about three from the Guildhall, and arrived at Mr. Pitt's house, "where they were very politely received." The cavalcade then returned, amidst the acclamation of applauding thousands, to the Grocers' Hall, where Mr. Pitt received the freedom of the City, and was afterwards entertained with a most sumptuous dinner, served with the utmost elegance and profusion. About eleven o'clock Mr. Pitt and friends took leave of the company, and on getting into his carriage was again drawn by the populace in like manner as he had been from Charing Cross to the Hall. This procession, however, proved most injudicious. Mr. Pitt returned through Westminster in a triumphant manner, where it was now well known there was a divided party, and where the animosity which one party bore against the other was already assuming the shape of brute force. Those among the multitude opposed to his principles naturally took offence, and the Minister, though supported by chosen friends, incurred grave risk in venturing among an indiscriminate multitude at night, "where," according to the chronicle, "every man acted either as his particular interest, the fumes of his wine, the spirits of his punch, or the mad consequences of gin directed." The consequence was that Mr. Pitt's passage through St. James's Street was the cause of a most indecent outrage against the peace. The populace there attacked him about half-past twelve o'clock, first with hisses and groans, and then with more substantial weapons, until the tumult of popular rage rose to a complete riot, and the poor men harnessed to the carriage were obliged to quit their traces and act *se defendendo*. The assailants being much more numerous than the supporters, the carriage remained at the mercy of the people, and was instantly demolished. Mr. Pitt escaped into an hotel without receiving any injury except what the surprise of so unexpected an attack occasioned. This riot fairly indicated the state of political feeling in Westminster, and proved only too plain an augury of the violence to be expected in the coming contest. The caricature of this extraordinary procession to Grocers' Hall, which was circulated all over the British Isles, is an extremely amusing one, showing, in the following order:—

Two marshalmen; a body of constables under the City Marshal on horseback; the standard-bearer; six City pendants, with their trains supported by children decorated with scarlet and white ribbons; the City state banner carried by City watermen in scarlet jackets, silver badges, and white caps; Artillery Company's music; committee in their carriages, with their servants wearing blue cockades; a large blue pendant with the words "Pitt and the Constitution;" Upper City Marshal on horseback; chairman of committee, with Mr. Chancellor Pitt and Mr. Pitt's friends, including the Marquis of Carmarthen and the Lords Temple, Chatham, Sydney, with several others of the nobility. Comical figures are represented leaning out of the windows making such exclamations as "O what a charming youth!" "Very like his father," "Huzza for Master Billy," &c., while the rabble in the wake of the procession are represented as shouting "Pitt and plum-pudding for ever!" The great Pitt himself is drawn almost immediately under the signboard of his father, Lord Chatham, upon which is written, in large letters, "Neat wines."

On the night following the King's proclamation one of the most extraordinary burglaries took place that has ever been known. Some daring villains broke into the house of the Lord Chancellor, in Great Ormond Street, and carried off undiscovered the Great Seal of England, the mace, and the purse, besides several articles of plate and about forty guineas. This robbery created the greatest consternation in town; for that an event so singular should happen at so critical a moment as on the eve of a dissolution of Parliament, when the Great Seal was necessary to the proclamation, naturally gave rise to conjecture, and induced the public, inapt to judge from constructive evidence as the English people confessedly are, to imagine that the robbery was a political manœuvre on one part or the other. The last attempt of this nature before this time was made by Colonel Blood, who, in the year 1671, formed the daring plan of carrying off the crown from the Tower, and went with three companions all armed with rapier-blades in their canes and each with a dagger and a pair of pistols, the colonel habiting himself like a clergyman, and "by various arts insinuating himself into the good graces of Mr. Edwards, the keeper." But, curiously enough, Colonel Blood, instead of being condemned to die for treason, was examined by the King immediately after his arrest, and for his daring was awarded a pension of £500 a year for life. There can be no doubt that the Great Seal in this case was not stolen for booty alone, since it could not possibly afford any temptation to ordinary robbers; the design of political agents (for it could be no other) was, however, frustrated, and proved abortive, a new Seal having been ordered to be made to meet the

requirements necessitated by a dissolution and a proclamation. Eventually it was discovered that two notorious housebreakers, believed to have been engaged for the purpose, had stolen and melted the seal, and had then sold it to a Jew.

The animosity which had been raised against Mr. Fox's party by Sir Cecil Wray and his supporters was most bitter, and they proposed to run a second candidate in order to oppose his return. Lord Hood having been invited for this purpose, he consented to the memorial of the electors, and the following joint address was issued immediately after the dissolution took place:—

GENTLEMEN,—Having had the honour of being called upon by a very considerable body of the worthy and independent electors of the city of Westminster to offer ourselves as joint candidates to represent this great and respectable city in Parliament on the approaching election, we beg leave to solicit the honour of your countenance and support; and if we should be so fortunate, through your voluntary suffrages, to become your representatives, we shall endeavour to acquit ourselves in the high and important trust with zeal and fidelity, and we trust in full conformity to your sentiments and wishes.

We have the honour to be, Gentlemen,

Your most faithful and obedient Servants,

HOOD.

CECIL WRAY.

Mr. Fox's address was more lengthy. In it he stated that he had found the Indian affairs in anarchy and confusion, and claimed to have rectified and afterwards ratified the articles of peace; that he had endeavoured to secure the public money lent to the India Company without injuring the Company's affairs, lodging the power in the people's representatives as being the channel through which it was lent; and that, in order to lessen the National Debt and raise public credit, without oppressing the already too much oppressed subject, he recommended committees to be appointed to look into the abuses of the customs, excise, and smuggling business, which committees had already declared they had made discoveries which would be a saving to the nation of between two and three millions yearly.

When it was observed how strenuously the Duchess of Devonshire exerted herself in Mr. Fox's cause, the following appeared in one of the morning papers, entitled the "Influence of Beauty":—

A sober, plain Englishman can really have no opinion of his own, if his understanding is to be attacked by the arguments of eyes. He can have no chance of his liberty, if weapons so irresistible as smiles and glances are used against him. The influence of beauty, therefore, must be more dangerous in a free country than the secret influence of the Crown. If it should be admitted that ladies have a right to canvass for their favourite candidate, and to exercise the arts of never-

failing beauty against the unsuspecting hearts of Englishmen, their next step will be to vote for them; and they will maintain their franchises by arguments which we cannot refute. Having gained this, they will next get into Parliament themselves, and then farewell to our liberties as a free people! The ladies now have the confidence to aspire to an equal elevation with the man in everything. They aver that genius is of no sex, and, finding themselves possessed of equal talents, they presume to cultivate them to an equal degree of polish. Is it to be endured that they should not only triumph over us in figure and face, but that they should also be superior to us in accomplishments and sense? Far be it from the wishes of all sober men!

Let it be therefore known from this time forth,

That it shall be downright impudence in any woman of rank to have the condescension of speaking to any person of a lower condition.

That ladies of quality have no right to entertain friendships, or, if they should be so indiscreet and unfashionable as to prefer one man to another, that it is absolute vulgarity in them to expose it to the world.

That ladies of quality have no business with the affairs of the nation.

That ladies ought never to come out of the nursery except to make a pudding for dinner; and that, if they have any spare time, it should be occupied in the stitching of chair covers.

The attempts at ribaldry against the Duchess of Devonshire, and the absolutely vile charges levelled against her honour and virtue, were extremely scandalous and indecent: happily for the credit of England, a marked change for the better in this respect has been wrought during this century. One of the electioneering advertisements circulated by Hood and Wray, in large letters, is irresistibly comic to us of the present day: "To be hired for the day, several pair of ruby pouting lips of the first quality, to be kissed by rum dukes, queer dukes, butchers, draymen, dustmen, and chimney-sweepers. Please to inquire at Devon & Co.'s Crimson Pouting Warehouse, Piccadilly." Again:

Yesterday the beautiful coalition Duchess again exerted herself in the cause of Mr. Fox. Her Grace was dressed in a black riding habit, probably lamenting the hopeless condition of the party. The weather being cold, her Grace had Paddy L——, the blanket merchant, in her carriage. It was remarked that affairs must be in a desperate way indeed when the ladies were obliged to have recourse to brandy. When the canvassing Duchess solicited a tradesman in York Street for his vote and interest in favour of Mr. Fox, he said he could not have refused her request if she had been in company with a gentleman. The Duchess yesterday asked a butcher for his vote. "I will give your Grace a plumper," says the tradesman, "and procure you five more on a certain condition." "What is that?" asked her Grace. "That your Grace will give me a kiss," he returned. "Why then,"



says the charming Duchess, "take one." Who would not purchase the kiss of a favourite at any price? Does not her Grace, who gives a kiss for a vote, pay for it a valuable consideration? Have a care, fair Devon; bribery is by common law either imprisonment or the pillory. The Duchess desires us to state that in future, when she condescends to favour any shoemaker, or other mechanic, with a salute, she expects that he will kiss fair, and not take improper liberties, &c. &c.

*Supposed Extract of a Letter to Mr. Fox, from a certain canvassing Duchess.*

DEAR CHARLES,—Yesterday I sent you three votes, but went through great fatigue to procure them; it cost me ten kisses for every plumper. I'm very much afraid we are done up—will see you at the porter shop and consult ways and means.

Yours,

S—A D—E.

It would appear from the very impartial account given of this extraordinary election, remarkable for the savageness with which one party attacked the other, and the scurrility with which the wits demeaned themselves in their writings on behalf of their respective candidates, that Mr. Fox's opposition was directed chiefly against Sir Cecil Wray, whose colleague, Lord Hood, escaped all that opprobrium, bitter invective, and sarcasm which was scattered in hand-bills and advertisements through the city. Great numbers of the electors turned against Sir Cecil Wray for three reasons: first, for his ingratitude to Mr. Fox, who had secured his election on a former occasion; secondly, on account of a motion he had made in the House for the pulling down Chelsea Hospital, which was used as an asylum for old and disabled soldiers; and thirdly, on account of a tax he had proposed should be made on maid-servants. The following queries were addressed to Sir Cecil Wray, by "An Elector," on these subjects:—

1. Did you, or did you not, propose a tax on maid-servants?
2. Could this tax be attended with any other effect than that of oppressing that sex whom every man is, by nature and humanity, bound to protect? On the contrary, was it not calculated to increase prostitution, by destroying the means of female subsistence?
3. Did you, or did you not, declare it as your wish, in the House of Commons, that Chelsea Hospital should be demolished?
4. Are you so ignorant as not to know that Chelsea Hospital was founded as an asylum for those brave fellows who have grown grey or have been disabled in the service of their country, and as the incitement to military emulation?
5. Are you so little of a politician as not to know that the nation, by this act of inhuman economy, would lose more by the destruction of so noble a spur to brave actions than it could possibly gain by the wretched savings of such despicable parsimony?
6. Is this system of military oppression to receive a final accom-

plishment by your gallant colleague's proposing the same plan with respect to the disabled seamen of Greenwich Hospital that you have had the honour of suggesting concerning your fellow-soldiers of Chelsea?

7. Was not Mr. Fox the first person that brought you into notice as a public man? And was it not to his interposition that you were originally indebted for any connection with the city of Westminster?

8. Did you not basely desert him on the first public occasion, and are you not, at this moment, endeavouring to requite him for the generosity of his support at your election by attempting to deprive him of his?

9. Was not your pretence for this ingratitude, that he had formed a junction with a party with the major and more obnoxious part of whom you are at this time actually connected in a league against the independence of the House of Commons and the natural rights of the people?

10. Can you, under this complication of disgraceful circumstances, expect that either good women, brave men, or virtuous statesmen can esteem you in private or support you in public?

Sir Cecil Wray, in replying to these queries, circulated the following:—

1st. If it was kind in Mr. Fox to recommend Sir Cecil Wray to you formerly, can it be less so in Sir Cecil Wray to recommend Lord Hood to you now?

2ndly. Are not all the old soldiers in Chelsea Hospital pensioners? and can it be wrong to stand up in the House of Commons against pensioners?

3rdly. If maid-servants are taxed, can't you, all of you, raise their wages? and will not that prevent any ill consequence from the tax, and obviate every objection of inhumanity?

On the other hand, Sir Cecil Wray represented Mr. Fox as a libertine, a gambler, an invader of chartered rights, and an unprincipled man, in truth hating the people, but mean enough when out of office to offer them his services. He accused Mr. Fox of having joined Lord North after abusing him for more than ten years, and after saying "that the man who could approach his threshold would be the most infamous of mankind;" of having brought into Parliament the Receipt Tax, which proved to be most unpopular, and against which there was a great outcry; of having brought into Parliament a Bill for destroying the charter of the East India Company and seizing on their papers and effects; of having screened Mr. Powell and Mr. Bembridge, who were found to be in default at the Pay Office; of having hired the public papers when he came into office by giving each of the printers drafts on the Treasury for £500; of having caused the Lord Chancellor to be robbed

of the Great Seal in order to prevent the issuing of the writs for a general election; and of having promised peerages to some twenty of his dissenting supporters if they would only support his India Bill. His private conduct was most maliciously attacked; his intrigues with women of fashion were published; and he was represented as being steeped in debt, it being asserted that he had flippantly remarked that he would pay his creditors "the day after Resurrection-day."

From an account in the possession of the present writer it seems that the Prince of Wales exerted himself on behalf of Mr. Fox, and that the King deputed one of the Gentlemen of the Bed-chamber to remonstrate with him on the impropriety of such an interference.

"His Majesty," said the messenger, "is surprised that the heir-apparent should take an active part on the subject of an election." "Be so good as present my humble duty to the King," replied the Prince, "and say it does not appear half so strange that the heir to his Majesty as that Majesty itself should take an active part on such an occasion. I never employed Weltjie till his Majesty had first employed the Earl of S——, and, if there was any difference between us, it was only that I had employed the more respectable messenger."

The rioting which took place during the election is almost without parallel, so strong and bitter was the public feeling on both sides during this memorable contest. About a quarter-past ten o'clock on Saturday evening, May 2, 1784, several fellows with marrow-bones and cleavers assembled before the door of Wood's Hotel apparently with a design of giving rise to those outrages which afterwards ensued. According to the statement of one of the followers of Hood and Wray, these gentry were very soon joined by a considerable number of ruffians armed with bludgeons, who violently assaulted every person quitting the hotel. Apprehensive that this hired mob would force their way upstairs into the rooms occupied by Hood and Wray, Mr. Wood and his servants endeavoured to guard the passage and prevent an entrance. This repulsion was the very thing which, it was alleged, the assailants desired, for no sooner was the attempt made to defend the hotel than the ruffians exercised their bludgeons on the heads of every opponent. With extreme difficulty the door was at last shut, which so exasperated the ruffians that they attempted, with cleavers and other weapons, to break it open; but, failing in their efforts, they demolished several of the windows, and pretended to disperse. Conceiving their vengeance to have been satiated, and everything appearing tolerably quiet, Mr. Wood and his servants ventured into the piazza with an intention of putting up the window shutters,

when on a sudden a whistle was given and repeated at several parts of Covent Garden, and, before it was possible to shut the door of the hotel, numerous ruffians formed themselves into a body and knocked down all persons whom they met. Every effort to keep them out being now found impossible, Mr. Wood, his servants, and several of the clerks endeavoured, as well as they could, to defend their lives, which were conceived to be in imminent danger, as the ruffians frequently made use of the expression: "Push in upon the scoundrels and knock them on the head." In this dreadful affray several persons were most terribly maimed; eight persons were picked up insensible; and one, Nicholas Casson, a peace officer, was so severely wounded that on the Tuesday morning following he expired. Several ruffians were taken into custody, but the magistrate, after severely reprimanding, discharged the prisoners, "as a serious prosecution might only create ill blood and widen differences."

Another riot is reported as having taken place owing to the conduct of the Court candidates and their committees, who retained in their service at the beginning of the election a numerous gang of men habited like sailors. By-standers at first were led to believe that they were a body of honest Jack Tars who, having been discharged from their ships, had come together as volunteers in support of their admiral, Lord Hood. It was not long, however, before the public was undeceived, for, having fixed the ensign, which they had brought, over the windows at Wood's Hotel, where the committee were sitting, this gang, conducted by some sea officers and others, went down to Paterson's room in King Street, which had been engaged for the reception of Lord Hood and Sir Cecil Wray's voters. On the third day of the polling, they appeared in great numbers and force, all armed with bludgeons, and, having surrounded the "Shakespeare," where Mr. Fox's committee were, they insulted several gentlemen coming in and going out of the house. At the conclusion of the poll that day several affrays happened. In the evening, all the lamps under the piazza were put out, and the "Shakespeare" was besieged; but by a spirited sally of the gentlemen from within, the sailors were dispersed for that night without doing any further mischief, though they threatened to pull down the "Shakespeare" and *Freemasons' Tavern*. On the Monday (the fourth day) the sailors appeared in greater force than before, continuing their former behaviour till towards the close of the poll, when they rushed forth to the front of the hustings, and there struck several persons who called out Mr. Fox. The mob then assembled, no longer able to endure the insults of these desperadoes and assassins, fell upon them and soon routed them; several had their skulls fractured,

others were afterwards picked up with arms, legs, and ribs broken. The sailors rallied again, and proceeded to St. James's Street, and several more had their skulls, legs, and arms fractured. A party of the Guards at last quelled this riot. On Tuesday (the fifth day) the sailors appeared as before, with greater bludgeons than ever; their opponents, consisting of chairmen, butchers, brewers, and others of the common people who had been abused by them, appeared also in force towards the conclusion of the poll. The sailors, dreading another conflict with their opponents, waylaid Mr. Fox himself in going from the "Shakespeare" to canvass some votes in Westminster. They proceeded, however, towards Westminster, and on their return, in the Strand, they fell in with their opponents, who again routed them. The same evening another riot happened in Bond Street and another in Covent Garden, in all of which the sailors were worsted, and several of them were carried to the hospitals without hope of recovery. On the afternoon of Wednesday, the sailors fell upon three chairmen and wounded them in a shocking manner; and soon afterwards, at the dusk of the evening, the sailors being assembled in King Street, the other party came round the garden in pursuit of them, when a terrible engagement ensued. Between twenty and thirty of the sailors fell in this conflict, and nine or ten of them, who were carried from the field of action to the neighbouring surgeons, were reported to be irrecoverable. Mr. Fox himself on more than one occasion during this struggle had a very narrow escape of his life, and even the Duchess of Devonshire was not free from molestation.

Fox was called by his supporters the Man of the People, and of course, by his opponents, Reynard; whereas Sir Cecil Wray was always addressed, as Judas Iscariot in the queries circulated by the busy wits who contributed so much to the literature of the period. A caricature of the rival candidates shows Mr. Fox as Demosthenes, with his left arm extended and his right hand laid across his breast in his favourite attitude when particularly anxious to make an impression on his listeners; to the right of him stands Lord Hood, as Themistocles, wearing his admiral's uniform, and cynically smiling at the Man of the People; while to the left, Sir Cecil Wray, as Judas Iscariot, with his arms folded, his face wearing a diabolical look of suppressed hate, is sneering over his shoulder at the imaginary eloquence of his rival.

Among the thousands of curious hand-bills which were circulated on both sides, perhaps the most remarkable were those written in imitation of the language of the Bible. Here is one against Mr. Fox, entitled "The Book of Tails," cap. i. :—

And now behold in those days, being the eighteenth century, an idol was adored in the land of Albion; and a new religion established; the people of that land being governed by the moon and the tides, and the following after novelties, and hankering after strange gods.

The idol was black, and fearful to behold; and therefore he pleased the lower sort, who delight in being terrified; and the higher order were charmed with his ill example, which destroyed all decorum and distinctions, and left them at liberty to follow their own inclinations, which were none of the best.

And now the women of the land rose up, and they said one unto another, "Let us raise the idol on high, and make the men fall down and worship him;" and they did so; and every living thing which had folly in it, worshipped the idol; and the geese and the ganders lifted up their silly heads, and cried, "Long live the Fox; may the Fox live for ever!"

Now behold a woman, fairer than wise, and more wily than discreet, said, "Let us take the Fox's tail for our type or symbol; let us bear it aloft, and run about the streets, and the squares, and the lanes, and the blind alleys, and make proselytes to the new religion."

The matrons and maidens, widows and widows bewitched, were seized with religious fury, and ran wild through the streets, crying, "Fox! Fox!" and they kissed the Fox's tail and put it in their hats.

The idol, raised upon the shoulders of the women, was adored by the men; and so the women of Piccadilly carried him up to the Temple.

Now this idol in his day worked miracles through the wicked spirit, but the good genius of Albion turned against him, and all his machinations in the end; and *thereby hangs a tail.*

For the sake of impartiality, apart from its comic interest, we have selected the following, entitled "Second Chapter of the Times":—

And after the people had proclaimed that Fox should be one of their elders, the tribe of Judas arose and said, "It shall not be so; we will have one of our own kidney, yea, one that will support the backstairs.

"And lo, we will have a poll demanded, as in the times of Trentham and Vandeput, and moreover we will send forth our bludgeon-men and terrify the people." And they did so.

And they thought themselves sure, and scoffed and reviled the Man of the People, saying, "We have conquered."

Now it came to pass that there arose a fair and wise woman from the West; and she said, "I will prevail against the unfaithful, and will join in the cause of the just."

Then she ordered the steeds to her chariot, and girded herself with the armour of Truth; and her face was bright as an angel, and her voice as a fine-toned cymbal.

Then she went into the city, saying, "Hearken unto me, O ye matrons; our fathers left us a free people, let us break the shackles

preparing for us, lest our children be bond-slaves." And they blessed her; yea, women with infants at their breasts sang in her praise.

But as she passed by, a certain Dippite reviled her; and his face was as the colour of a tallow candle, and on his head was a cap like unto his heart, for behold it was black.

And when he saw the daughter of Truth succeed, he smote his breast and gnashed his teeth, and called upon Satan to trouble the children of Truth.

Then the men of the city arose as from a deep sleep, and their eyes were opened, and they said, "Let us go up in numbers, for our cause is good; and let the sin of ingratitude fall on Judas Iscariot."

Now this Judas was a lanky man; and when he saw the people's champion prevail, his jaw dropped, and his face was an ell long; and when he would have spoken, a certain quivering came over him, yea, even from the crown of his head to the soles of his feet, and he fell flat on his back, even as a flounder.

And it came to pass that there issued from him an unsavoury smell, insomuch that the people cried, "Cast him out, cast him out!" And they did so.

Then they brought forth their champion and seated him in triumph, crowning him with laurels, and singing, "Long live Fox! May our champion live for ever!"

It was said, as an evidence of the state of the country at this time and of the extraordinary extent to which bribery was used on both sides, that this election cost Mr. Fox or his friends £1,000 per day, and that he had betted with so much success on his own election that his winnings went a great way towards defraying the expenses of it.

When the poll closed on May 17, 1784, the numbers stood as follows:—

Lord Hood . . . . .	6,694
Charles James Fox . . . . .	6,234
Sir Cecil Wray . . . . .	5,998

On this declaration being made by the High Bailiff of Westminster a scrutiny was duly demanded by Sir Cecil Wray. This proceeding was immediately objected to by Mr. Fox, who appeared to have the most voices, and of which he complained to the House on its first meeting as an illegal and unprecedented measure. From the hustings an adjournment was made to the vestry, where the High Bailiff still persisted in refusing to return the candidates who appeared to have the majority on the poll, and made a special return to the Sheriff of the county of Middlesex. In consequence of this, on the interest of Sir Thomas Dundas, Mr. Fox sat for Kirkwall, in order "that Parliament might not be deprived of such abilities, nor the popular cause want an able advocate." After counsel had been heard on both sides, the House of Commons ordered the High Bailiff

to proceed with the scrutiny, the result of which was that, after deducting the unqualified votes, Lord Hood and Mr. Fox, having a majority, were returned to represent the city of Westminster.

In honour of Mr. Fox's victory over the prerogative candidates, his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales held a *fête* at Carlton House, at which a company of nearly six hundred of the first persons of fashion assembled. The suite of rooms were laid out in the most superb style for their reception. Nine marquees were pitched in the gardens, and covers spread in each, consisting of devices equally expressive of the political principles and gallantry of his Highness. The *déjeuner* displayed two hundred and fifty covers of the most choice viands, confections, ices, and fruits. Four bands were disposed at proper distances in the gardens, two of which were composed of wind instruments; one was a regular orchestra, and one for country dances, at which Werner presided. Afterwards a party was formed for country dances and cotillons; this rural repast being considered as a revival of old English hospitality. In the evening the Carlton visitants met at Mrs. Crewe's, who gave a ball on the occasion, which was remarkable for its display of beauty and fashion, being one "of the most pleasant and jovial ever given in high life, and uniting all the charms of elegance, ease, and conviviality."

The account given of Mr. Fox's reception immediately after the declaration of the poll is perhaps the most remarkable incident connected with this extraordinary contest. On quitting the vestry, his friends, who were assembled to the number of many thousands, insisted on chairing him, and, according to the chronicle, "the grandest spectacle ensued ever known on such occasions." The crowds were innumerable; the windows were filled with the most beautiful women that ever youthful fancy could imagine; and the streets were lined with carriages. The description of "Henry IV." was demonstrated, and, notwithstanding the immense concourse and the general triumph, the whole was conducted not only with the greatest regularity, but with the profoundest peace. The following was the order of the procession:—Heralds on horseback; twenty-four marrow-bones and cleavers; the arms of Westminster; thirty firemen of Westminster; martial music; committees of the seven parishes, with white wands, following their respective banners, and attended by a vast number of gentlemen of the several districts; squadron of gentlemen on horseback in the blue and buff uniform; trumpets; flag with the words "The Rights of the Commons;" grand band of music; flag with the words "The Man of the People;" marshals on foot; triumphal chair, decorated with laurels, in

[Vol. CXXIV. No. CCXLVIII.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LXVIII. No. II. K K



which was seated the Right Hon. Charles James Fox; trumpets; flag with the words "The Whig Cause;" second squadron of horse; Liberty Boys of Newport Market; Mr. Fox's carriage crowned with laurels; banner with the words "Sacred to Female Patriotism;" blue standard inscribed, "Independence;" state carriages of their Graces the Duchesses of Portland and Devonshire, drawn by six horses superbly caparisoned, with six running footmen attendant on each; gentlemen's servants, closing the procession, two and two, &c. &c. The route of the procession was round Covent Garden, down Russell and Catherine Streets, into the Strand, down Parliament Street, round the end of Great George Street, and back to Charing Cross, Pall Mall, &c., St. James's Street, Piccadilly, Berkeley Street, round Berkeley Square, back through Berkeley Street and into Devonshire Court Yard, where the various banners formed in front, while Mr. Fox, alighting from his chair, ascended the steps, and joined his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, their Graces the Duke and Duchess of Devonshire, Lady Duncannon, and a train of other illustrious beauties, who were assembled on the platform in order to greet the arrival of their favourite representative. Mr. Fox from thence addressed his friends in an elegant speech, most cordially thanking them for the high honour they had conferred upon him, and requesting, as their triumph in the cause of freedom and independence had been so highly honourable to him and themselves, it might not be sullied by the smallest mark of tumult or intemperance.

The original poetry which was written during this election was, on the whole, fairly creditable, though the satirical portion of it was marred by much indecent abuse, to be expected of this immoral age. But one wonders that the scores of songs, ballads, sonnets, epigrams, satirical parodies, and dramas, which were of the higher order of merit, should have so quickly died out from the literature of the country. Some of them are extremely pointed, and in the frequent references to the classics display much learning, while the ballads sung in taverns at the convivial meetings of the wits are very clever parodies on the popular English songs.

The drawings and caricatures are not one whit less interesting, and it certainly seems as if the genius of the land had entered, heart and soul, into this contest. The first of these represents the Duchess of Devonshire as "Female Patriotism," hand in hand with "Liberty" and "Fame" on either side—two exquisitely drawn female beauties carrying respectively a staff and a trumpet—in the act of presentation to Britannia, whose extended right hand holds a wreath with which she is about to crown the Duchess, "infused with a fortitude from Heaven."



The next represents Mr. Churchill, Sir Cecil Wray's agent, with a Subscription Scrutiny Box under his arm, led by an ugly dog, and crying :

Pity the weak and needy, pray ;  
Oh pity me, I've lost the day.

The title of this drawing is "The Westminster Mendicant," and beneath it is written :

Ye Christians, charitable, good, and civil,  
Pray, something give to this poor wandering devil,  
By men cast out, perhaps by God forgiven,  
Then may not Judas find a road to heaven ?

The next represents Mr. Fox as the Westminster Watchman, with a halo round his head on which is written "Liberty," a staff in his hand emblematic of "Uprightness," a bulldog by his side called "Vigilance," and a lantern in front of him denoting "Truth." In the background are the two rival candidates hurrying towards Chelsea Hospital. The next represents Mr. Fox bearing in front of him the Shield of Truth, and, with sword uplifted, battling with a hydra, whose heads, spitting venom, indicate Tyranny, Despotism, Oppression, Secret Influence, Duplicity, and Corruption ; behind the champion of the people is a group of Englishmen, Irishmen, and East Indians, carrying "the Standard of Universal Liberty." The next, entitled "The Hanoverian Horse and the British Lion," represents the two famous rivals, Pitt and Fox, the former riding bareback the horse "Prerogative," which is kicking backwards at "My Faithful Commons ;" while the latter, on the back of the lion, is urging the other to dismount before he gets a fall. The horse is supposed to be performing some feat as in a hippodrome, and is trampling on a cloth on which is inscribed "Bill of Rights," while Mr. Fox is holding up the bit and reins in his hand. Among the best of the others are a drawing of "The Westminster Deserter drummed out of the Regiment," in which Sir Cecil Wray is represented as standing in front of an army of wounded pensioners carrying crutches, and maid-servants with brooms and besoms, while Mr. Fox is standing opposite as the Champion of the People, who are waving their hats and using their lungs with great energy ; a "Procession to the Hustings after a Successful Canvass," in the foreground of which are three beauties, carrying standards, the first representing a cockerel crowing on the top of a pair of breeches, with the words "The Man of the People," the second with a sketch of a running fox, and the words "The Rights of the Commons," and the third with a pole, thrust through woman's petticoats, with a cap on the top bearing

the words, "No Tax on Maid-servants;" "Wit's Last Stake," representing the Duchess of Devonshire as seated on Mr. Fox's knee, with her legs raised up somewhat indecently before a cobbler, who is in the act of measuring her for a pair of boots (this is supposed to be a satire on her Grace's method of canvassing); "Mars and Venus, or Sir Cecil chastised," showing Sir Cecil Wray in the act of receiving castigation from a military pensioner on the one side with a crutch and a female servant on the other; and "A Political Heat run in Covent Garden, between Old Veteran, a famous horse, the property of his Majesty, Duchess, a filly, the property of the Duke of Devonshire, and Judas, an obstinate ass, who was out-distanced" (this drawing representing the final state of the poll), and respectively ridden by Lord Hood, exclaiming, "Worthy Sir Cecil, I'm sorry for you, but don't be discouraged, a scrutiny will do your business at any rate." Mr. Fox is represented as addressing the defeated candidate with "It is not in the force of mortal arm, scarcely in fate, to bind the struggling soul that, galled by wanton power, indignant swells against oppression," and Sir Cecil Wray as crying, "Give me a helping hand, my lord, or I'm undone!"

Perhaps there never was during any election so much brute force, literary and artistic power, and bribery (in the shape not only of monetary payment, but of secret influence, and the cheaper, through not less seductive, charms of female beauty) used as on this occasion. And the most curious incident about the whole proceedings was that, after a scrutiny had taken place and several hundreds on both sides were proved guilty of having received bribes, the election was declared valid, and Lord Hood and Mr. Fox sat for the city and liberty of Westminster in the House of Commons!

## INDEPENDENT SECTION.

*[Under the above title a limited portion of THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW is occasionally set apart for the reception of able Articles, which, though harmonizing with the general spirit and aims of the Review, may contain opinions at variance with the particular ideas or measures it advocates. The object of the Editors in introducing this department, is to facilitate the expression of opinion by men of high mental power and culture, who, while they are zealous friends of freedom and progress, yet differ widely on special points of great practical concern, both from the Editors and from each other.]*

## THE "IRISH DIFFICULTY."

WE constantly hear a great deal about what is called the "Irish difficulty." In a lecture delivered some years since in Edinburgh by Dr. Lyon Playfair, that eminent person is reported to have said :—

There is nothing inherent in the soil, in the Celtic origin of the people, or in the religion of Ireland, that should prevent it becoming an important manufacturing country; for all these conditions are represented in other prosperous nations. The chief difficulty for its development consists in the fact that England has impressed a character on the people by centuries of misrule, and that time is requisite for the change of character.

If this be so, we should infer that England ought to abdicate a control which centuries of misrule have demonstrated her incapacity to exercise otherwise than injuriously to Ireland.

For eighty-five years we have been subjected to English legislation; a length of time sufficient to test the effect on Ireland of the legislative union; and at the end of that long period we find our country disturbed by conspiracies; great portions of its revenues, public and private, exported to England; its inhabitants divided into hostile classes; whole districts swept by occasional famines; bitter discontent developing into horrible crimes; manufacturing industry brought so low that only about 80,000 persons in a population that still amounts to 5,000,000 are engaged in it; multitudes flying to America in pursuit of that prosperity which at home they have failed to acquire beneath the rule of an alien Legislature, and bearing with them into exile deep and ineradicable hatred of the system that has stripped their native land of the means God had given for their support.

Such is the condition of Ireland in the eighty-fifth year of the Union; and it fulfils the predictions of Grattan and his friends concerning the inevitable result of abolishing the Irish Parliament. Some persons have complained that in proportion as England makes concessions to Ireland, the hostility of Ireland

to England appears to increase. The sting of the grievance is, that England has usurped the power of making laws for Ireland; and whatever her "concessions" may be, the inherent wrong and evil of the usurpation still leave Ireland in the condition I have sketched. The "concessions," as they are called, have in general been withheld until they have been wrung out of our rulers by violent agitation. They have been wrung out of a Legislature with which we neither have, nor can have, any national sympathy—a Legislature into whose power we have been dragged by a policy of complicated crime unsurpassed in the annals of political iniquity.

In effecting the destruction of the Irish Legislature, Pitt destroyed the only institution competent to bring order out of popular confusion in Ireland, to weld our different classes into one homogeneous whole, and to promote the prosperity and general contentment of the Irish people. It had its faults, like every human institution; and most of its faults may be traced to English influence operating on its members. But despite its faults it conferred on Ireland advantages which no other institution could possibly confer; advantages summarised by Grattan in a memorable passage. Planted on the soil of Ireland, legislating in the Irish capital, the instincts of nationhood inevitably produced in it that love of country and that pride in national dignity and national honour which broke the foreign shackles on our trade and legislation in 1779 and 1782; and which secured to us an amount of commercial, manufacturing, and agricultural progress attested by a host of witnesses whose words are too well known to need repetition here. I quote, because it illustrates the blessing of home government, the following passage from the Marquis of Lorne's reply to an address presented to him by the Canadian Parliament:—

"In no other land," says the Marquis, "have the last seventeen years witnessed such progress. You are not the subjects, but the free allies of a country that gave you birth, and is ready with all its energy to be the champion of your interests."

This admission of the benefits conferred by self-government on Canada sounds almost like an echo of the declarations of Plunket, Bushe, Grattan, Earl Grey, and many another witness of the results of self-government in Ireland under the constitution of 1782. "She (Ireland) has advanced," said Plunket, "with a rapidity astonishing even to herself."

Lord Lorne's words could never have been addressed to the Canadians if they had been ruled from London, overtaxed, deprived of their own resources and revenues, and insulted by "concessions" extorted by violent agitation and grudgingly yielded to violence. The condition of Canada in such circum-

stances would have borne a disastrous resemblance to the present condition of Ireland.

It is not hard to account for the chronic turbulence of our country. Grattan, it will be remembered, predicted that the vices inseparable from human nature would, when deprived of the natural escape-valve of a native Parliament, be turned inwards, and prey on the vitals of society in dangerous conspiracies.

Pitt was strongly pressed by the commercial and manufacturing interests of Great Britain to check the rivalry of Ireland, which they deemed extremely formidable. Prior to 1779 England had strangled Irish trade by direct legislation, but the vigorous patriotism of the Irish volunteer army in that year, and the legislative independence won in 1782, protected Ireland from this species of aggression; so that the only means of arresting her progress that remained was the destruction of her national Parliament.

To effect the legislative union it was necessary to cover Ireland with an army of occupation. To find a pretext for infesting us with such an army it was necessary to get up a rebellion. To get up a rebellion it was necessary to institute a system of infernal persecution; of which, among the many witnesses, are the Marquis Cornwallis, Lord Gosford, the Earl of Moira, Earl Fitzwilliam, Lord Holland, Lord John Russell, and Henry Grattan; whose combined testimony establishes the hideous fact that the Irish people were deliberately driven to revolt by the extensive employment of personal torture, of murder, and of arson. "Ireland," says Lord Holland, "was bleeding under the hardest tyranny our times have witnessed."

Thus was the rebellion of 1798 provoked; and thus was a pretext obtained for letting loose an army of 137,590 men on Ireland, an army sufficiently strong to crush popular resistance to the Union; while the Government resorted to a system of gigantic bribery in a Parliament dexterously packed for the question.

We are horrified at the ghastly and deliberate wickedness of the late James Carey's murder-club; but, comparing one diabolical conspiracy with another, it seems to me indisputable that the murder-club of Pitt, Castlereagh, and Clare, was far worse than the murder-club inaugurated by James Carey. Compare the two.

Carey, according to his own account, had organised a party of 250 assassins, of whom 100 were to be dispersed through Ireland, 100 through England, while fifty scoundrels were to be posted in Dublin. These men were bound, on pain of death, to assassinate any member of the Government, or any supporter of

the Government, pointed out by their leaders. Had their machinery of murder gone on as they intended, we may conclude that from fifty or sixty to one hundred of the officers of Her Majesty's executive would have fallen victims to their knives or their bullets. The scheme was hellish in its inception; and if we regard it as a scheme of political policy it was supremely idiotic.

But let us compare it with the machinations of Pitt and his agents. Instead of 250 assassins, whose leaders contemplated the murder of perhaps 100, possibly 200, of the members or friends of the Government, we have a deliberate scheme of far greater magnitude, involving, not the sacrifice of 100 or 200 lives, but the sacrifice of many thousands of lives; not the employment of 250 murderers, but of 137,590 ruffian soldiers, who, as the Viceroy, Lord Cornwallis, said, *delighted in murder*,\* whose campaign was marked by every species of brutality, and who were poured into our country to put down an insurrection which had been intentionally provoked by Pitt's Government in the teeth of Earl Fitzwilliam's solemn warning, that their policy would raise a flame in Ireland which nothing but the force of arms could keep down.

The Reverend James Gordon, a clergyman of the Established Church, records that of the 30,000 "natives" slain in the rebellion of 1798, more were killed in cold blood than fell in battle. "No quarter," he says, "was given to persons taken prisoners as rebels, with or without arms."†

James Carey's murder-club, execrable as it is, becomes absolutely dwarfed in comparison with Pitt's. And the existence of such a horrible conspiracy as Carey's is merely a symptom of the radical disease, the total dislocation of the Irish social and political frame, produced by the criminal destruction of the Irish Parliament.

The Union was evolved from the bloody pandemonium carefully prepared by Pitt and his confederates; and the nineteenth century opened with the heaviest blow that had yet been aimed at the honour, the peace, and the prosperity of Ireland.

As my object at present is not so much to examine the motives which prompted the Union as to trace its effects on the condition of Ireland, I shall not refer in detail to the systematic jealousy of every form of Irish industrial progress which England had

\* "The violence of our friends, and their folly in endeavouring to make it a religious war, added to the ferocity of our troops, who delight in murder, most powerfully counteract all plans of conciliation." (Lord Cornwallis to General Ross, July 1, 1798: "Cornwallis Correspondence.")

† Gordon's History, p. 269, as quoted by the Rev. J. Godkin in "The Rights of Ireland."

manifested from the days of Charles the Second. It is enough to state that when in 1785 commercial arrangements between the two countries were negotiated, Pitt was informed by the British delegates that the concessions to Ireland which they feared he was going to make would injure the manufacturing interests of Great Britain. Pitt tried to calm their fears by assuring them that "it could not be supposed that Ireland, poor as she is, and young in manufacture, can ever rival England, established in trade and rich in capital."

If the comparative smallness of Irish capital was an obstacle to Irish manufacturing rivalry with England, it seems to have occurred to the British remonstrants that the obstacle would be rendered insurmountable by destroying the power of Ireland to retain her own income and so to accumulate capital. They accordingly told Pitt that if Ireland could be brought under a legislative union their difficulty would disappear. They had some reason to say so; for the recuperative powers of Ireland were quickly developed under the Constitution of 1782. Friends and foes alike attest our astonishing advance. I do not repeat testimonies that I have elsewhere abundantly cited. One or two facts, however, may be usefully stated. On May 12, 1785, Mr. Courtenay in the English House of Commons said that in Ireland Mr. Brooke had invested a capital of £80,000 in the cotton trade, and employed 10,000 hands. In 1800, as we learn from the "Castlereagh Correspondence," this trade had so far expanded as to employ large numbers of people at Belfast, Balbriggan, Dublin, and Cork. Mr. Hamilton of Balbriggan affirmed that it retained £250,000 in Ireland. Mr. Clarke, as the same Correspondence informs us, told Lord Castlereagh that he had expended £20,000 in setting up the cotton business at Palmerstown, county Dublin, which gave constant support to a thousand persons.

To go back for a moment to 1785: Mr. Pitt, in that year, in a debate on the Irish commercial propositions, "most earnestly entreated the House not to suffer themselves to be carried away by the idea that a poor country, merely because she enjoyed some comparative exemption from taxes, was therefore able to cope with a rich and powerful country; the fact, he was ready to contend, was by no means so."

If comparative exemption from taxes did not enable Ireland to cope with England in manufacturing rivalry, it follows that when by the Union the taxation was ruinously increased, the inability of Ireland to preserve her manufacturing interests became intensified. Take from Ireland the power to retain, to employ, to unfold her own resources; transfer the control of those resources to a powerful neighbour whose hostility had been



a thousand times fatally manifested ; in a word, bring Ireland under a legislative union, and the decay of her nascent manufactures would be effectually accomplished.

Well, the deed was done, and the result was exactly what the British manufacturers in 1785 had hoped for and had prophesied.

We have now to review the condition of a people thrown almost wholly for support upon agriculture. Deprived of the manufacturing and commercial outlet for the junior members of their families, restricted from making improvements by the shortness of their tenures and by the fear that at the expiration of their leases any improvement they might make would be confiscated by an addition to the rent, the Irish peasantry were reduced to a state which elicited from a very able Protestant clergyman, the Reverend Charles Boyton, Fellow of Trinity College, the following testimony, which occurs in a speech delivered by him in 1834 at a great meeting of Protestant landlords in Dublin :—"In seeking the cause of your insecurity, of what is shaking every property and privilege and law to its foundation, you are not to look to Popery, not to disaffection, not to democracy. You must go deeper, and seek it in the destitution and agony of the population."

That destitution and its resulting agony were indeed appalling. Commissions of inquiry into Irish distress and its causes were from time to time issued, and although no practical benefit followed their labours—although none of them recommended the only true remedy for the evils they recorded—yet the mass of facts which they collected are of great historical value and political use, as showing the condition to which our people had been brought by the system that deprived them of all other sources of support than their labour on the soil. I throw together the statements of unimpeachable witnesses, with regard rather to the concurrence of their testimonies than to strict chronological sequence. In 1825 Mr. John Leslie Foster, who was for many years a Baron of the Exchequer, gave to the Lords' committee on the state of Ireland the following account of the wholesale eviction of tenants :—

Within the last two years a perfect panic on the subject of population prevailed among all persons interested in land in Ireland ; and they are at this moment applying a corrective check of the most violent description to the increase of population, which there has been too much reason to deplore. *The principle of dispeopling estates is going on in every part of Ireland where it can be effected.* If your lordships ask me what becomes of the surplus stock of population, it is a matter on which I have, in my late journeys through Ireland, endeavoured to form some opinion ; and I conceive that in many

instances they betake themselves to the nearest large towns, and there occupy, as lodgers, the most wretched hovels, in the most miserable outlets, in the vain hope of getting a day's work. Though this expectation too often proves unfounded, it is the only course possible for them to take. Their resort to these towns produces such misery as it is impossible to describe.

In 1824 Francis Blackburn, Esq., K.C., who had been appointed to administer one of the Insurrection Acts, gave the following information to the Lords' committee. Speaking of Lord Stradbroke's property in the county Limerick, he said :

On that property, as represented to me, and as I believe, there were forty or fifty families; the extent of the estate is between four and five hundred acres. The whole of that numerous body, consisting of persons of all ages and both sexes, were dispossessed and their houses prostrated; they were, I believe, generally speaking, destitute of the means of support, and unless relieved by people from charitable motives, I do not know what has become of them. But the circumstance created a good deal of irritation in the country, and we were apprehensive of its effects in endangering the public peace. *This is not a singular case; the same thing in a greater or less degree is generally prevalent in the whole of the country.*

Can language exaggerate the horror of such a condition? A systematic movement generally prevalent in the whole of the country to deprive vast numbers of the people of their sole means of existence! Mr. Blackburn is asked what, in his opinion, is the source of popular discontent? He answers: "The extreme misery and wretchedness of the population. . . . It is a subject on which an Englishman can scarcely be said to have the materials even for belief."

The report of the Commons' committee of 1830 thus describes the situation of the evicted tenantry :

Their condition is necessarily most deplorable. It would be impossible for language to convey an idea of the state of the distress to which the ejected tenantry have been reduced, or the disease, misery, and even vice, which they have propagated in the towns where they have settled. . . . *A vast number of them have perished of want.*

Truly the English manufacturers were wise in their generation when they told Mr. Pitt that a legislative union would remove *their* difficulty.

Let us [says the late Isaac Butt in his "Plea for the Celtic Race"], let us consider the effect of the evictions upon the evicted people. To what were they to turn? The sentence that drives them from the land, to what doom does it consign them? It is—the deprivation of the means of life. Terrible—terrible when we remember the multitudes that have been so driven out!

"The clearance system" was the usual phrase to designate the expulsion of the ~~the~~ tenantry. "The crowbar brigade" was the common designation of the persons employed to demolish their cottages. I again quote Isaac Butt :

The very phrases of "clearing estates" and "clearances"—words that have passed into common use—indicate the spirit in which the Irish tenantry have been dealt with. In newly settled countries land is said to be "cleared" when the forest is cut down, the jungle or the brushwood is removed, and the wild beasts are driven away. In Ireland estates are "cleared" when the human beings that encumbered them are swept from the soil.

A commission of inquiry, instituted in 1833, presented their final report in 1836, and in it they give the following account of the state of the labouring population :

A great portion of them are insufficiently provided at any time with the commonest necessities of life. Their habitations are wretched hovels ; several of a family sleep together upon straw or upon the bare ground, sometimes with a blanket, sometimes without even so much to cover them. Their food commonly consists of dry potatoes, and with these they are at times so scantily supplied as to be obliged to stint themselves to one spare meal in the day. There are even instances of persons being driven by hunger to seek sustenance in wild herbs. They sometimes get a herring or a little milk ; but they never get meat, except at Christmas, Easter, and Shrovetide.

This description of a large portion of the agricultural population supplies a significant commentary on Mr. Pitt's pretence, that the Union would impart to Ireland vast masses of the wealth of England ; and it fixes the stigma of reckless falsehood on Mr. Spring Rice's declaration in the House of Commons, that Ireland at that very time was advancing in prosperity with giant strides..

The rage for clearing estates became a perfect mania. I have, in other publications, frequently referred to the late Mr. Sharman Crawford's statement, derived from Parliamentary returns, that "a dreadful and heartless persecution is and has been going on upon the part of the landlords of Ireland against the small holders." Mr. Crawford quoted two returns. The first return included the Civil Bill ejectments for seven years, from 1827 to 1833 inclusive. The second return included the Civil Bill ejectments for the five years from 1838 to 1843 inclusive. From the second return Mr. Crawford showed that the number of persons against whom ejectment proceedings had been taken in the latter period of five years amounted to 356,985 ; and he further affirmed that the extermination of the people was proceeding in a rapidly increasing ratio. His letter from which I take these

statements is dated June 7, 1843. The state of the law facilitated the enormities committed by the ill-disposed landlords. The Lord Chief Justice Pennefather used the following remarkable words when delivering judgment in Hilary Term, 1843, on an ejectment case, *Delapp v. Leonard*: "The whole code relating to landlord and tenant in this country was framed with a view to the interests of the landlord alone, and to enforce the payment of rent by the tenants. The interest of the tenants never entered into the contemplation of the Legislature."

The persecution of the people became intolerable. As if the greed of the extortioners was not in itself a sufficient stimulant, sectarian animosity was brought into play, and the ferocious crusade against the lives of the people was still further embittered by furious invectives against the Catholic religion; invectives delivered from pulpits and from platforms, and adding fresh impulse to the hatred by which many landlords—but most certainly not all—were animated. Some of these invectives I have preserved as curiosities of rancorous vituperation.

I ask all impartial men whether any condition of matters could be more effectually calculated to demoralize a people? more admirably adapted to dissolve the moral bonds which should unite man with man? to destroy the moral and religious sense of respect for life and property? Great numbers of the people turned to perish by what Mr. Sharman Crawford justly called "a dreadful and heartless persecution;" their creed incessantly assailed with vituperative insolence; their existence in their native land deemed a nuisance by their persecutors. Now, I ask, could a people thus trampled on, thus outraged, be expected to display the virtues of good citizenship? Mr. Butt records that at the meeting where the Reverend Charles Boyton delivered the honourable sentiments already quoted, a clergyman of a very different stamp, the Reverend Marcus Beresford, afterwards Archbishop of Armagh, exhorted his clerical audience to drive from their glebe lands the Popish rebel and the Popish illicit distiller, and to plant good and faithful Protestants in their place. When the burst of cheering that greeted these words had subsided, the reverend gentleman went on: "I trust that every good and faithful minister of his God would sooner have potatoes and salt surrounded with Protestants, than live like princes surrounded with Papists."

This pestilent antagonism of race and religion has been carefully preserved by the annual Orange celebrations of battles fought nearly two centuries ago. It seems to me certain that if the Irish Parliament had continued to exist, this antagonism would have long since been absorbed into a common nationality, and Ireland would have been emancipated from its disturbing, degrading, and corrupting influence.

The evictions went on. Lords Lorton, Enniskillen, and Dunraven co-operated with what their advertisement terms "a numerous body of landed proprietors" to institute "A Protestant Tenantry Society."

Isaac Butt, writing in 1866, inquires :

How many thousand families within the last twenty years have been driven from their homes? In a book of authority and character I find it stated that in the year 1849 alone, 50,000 evictions took place. More than 50,000 such evictions took place in 1849. More than 50,000 families were turned out of their wretched dwellings without pity and without refuge. (Kay's "Social Condition of Europe," vol. i. p. 315.)

The evictions went on. The present Bishop of Meath, Doctor Nulty, gives the following account of the extermination practised in his diocese :

In the one county of Meath [writes his lordship], in this diocese, there are about 369,000 acres of land laid down in grass seeds or pasture. That vast territory was nearly all parcelled out about the commencement of this century in farms of various sizes, ranging from ten to seventy, eighty, or one hundred acres each. These farms were dotted over with clean, commodious, comfortable, whitewashed dwellings, with offices, outhouses, and the plant of well-to-do farmers. These dwellings were occupied by a race of the most laborious, industrious, hard-working, and virtuous people that ever lived in any country. But owing to the iniquitous system of land tenure, they have been almost all mercilessly evicted and swept away; and every vestige of the vast amount of human life, industry, contentment, and happiness that once flourished on these lands has been so carefully obliterated that, looking at them, one would imagine them to have been "prairie lands" since the creation.

A landlord who expressed his anxiety to introduce what he called "English ideas" into Ireland, and who acquired much notoriety in the recent agrarian disputes, told me in 1847 that our true policy was to get the Atlantic between us and the people. How the landlords overshot the mark, and injured their own interest, in this eager desire to expel the people, will appear later on.

I have asked if any system could be more demoralizing, more provocative of crime, than the exterminating system of which the people were the victims. The answer to this question is supplied by the evidence of intelligent witnesses, as recorded in the various reports to which reference has been made. With respect to agrarian disturbance, the Commons' committee of 1832 inform us in their report that "the removal of tenants from farms at the expiration of old leases is unquestionably a considerable cause of these disturbances."

John Cahill, Esq., surveyor and civil engineer, is asked by the Commons' committee of 1832, with respect to disturbance in the county Kilkenny :

Were there any other circumstances that contributed to that state of disturbance that has taken place ?

There were.

What are they ?

There were a good many people evicted and turned out of their farms. . . . About four years ago . . . there was one gentleman evicted 89 persons ; another, 96 ; another, 95.

Were these cases where the lands had fallen out of lease ?

They were.

Do you conceive that it has been these individuals who have been so turned out, from want of having proper means of supporting themselves, who have become wanderers and vagrants, and the source of the Whitefoot association that prevailed in that part of the country ?

I do very much consider so.

Major Warburton, Inspector-General of Constabulary, is asked by the Lords' committee in 1839 to account for outrage :

Have you, in your experience in Ireland, known outrages resulting from persons having been ejected from their property, and having no provision given them when they have been turned off the lands they have been in possession of ?

That has frequently been the cause of outrage.

Is not much of the discontent in Ireland to be attributed to misery as well as to wickedness ?

I am sure that destitution, when people are turned out of their lands and have no means, is a very great source of crime.

Instead of multiplying quotations from the reports above cited, which assign the persecution of the people as the cause of their agrarian crimes, I prefer to bring before the reader the impression produced by the facts on the mind of an English senator and statesman, Mr. Poulett Scrope, M.P., who justified the members of the Ribbon and Whitefoot conspiracies on the plea that their illegal combinations were indispensable to defend their own lives from the exterminators :

They feel [said he] that the continuance of the system of clearing estates which has been for many years in progress, is a question of life and death to them ; and therefore they rightly—aye, rightly, wisely, necessarily—combine against it. Therefore it is, however little minds may wonder at it, that they show no more repugnance to the shedding of blood in noonday, in the presence of assisting thousands, in the execution of the sentences of self-constituted tribunals, looked upon by them as the sole safeguard of their lives, than does a soldier hired to fight for his country's safety in the field of battle. . . . The peasantry in Ireland all obtain from the Whitefoot association

that essential protection to their existence which the established law, of the country refuses to afford. The Whitefoot system is the sole practical and efficient check upon the ejectment system.\*

The peasantry had been demoralized by the multiform evils that had followed from the Union. The manufacturing source of employment was cut off; the absentee drain, the tax drain, and the various other drains incident to the want of self-government, drew away millions of the annual income of the country, which, under the Home Parliament, would have circulated in various home channels for the support of the people. Rents were very frequently exorbitant. The landlords had originally hated the legislative union; but their clergy considered that their grasp on the Church revenues of Ireland was secured *in perpetuum* by that measure, and they were therefore professionally interested in preaching up England and Protestantism, and preaching down Ireland and Popery. The Protestant landocracy were naturally influenced by such teaching; and thus were their minds withdrawn from their country, and distorted and obscured to a degree that revived, perpetuated, and embittered their traditionary hostility to the Catholic people among whom their lot was cast. We have seen how that hostility was exercised in a furious campaign of extermination; and the reckless disregard of peasant life displayed by the exterminators inevitably produced a murderous reaction on the part of the peasantry.

This hideous condition of national disease, these social ulcers festering in every portion of the body-politic, exuding their poison in every department of the social state, could not have existed if the landlords of Ireland had been awake to their own true interests, and had cleansed their minds from the foulness of sectarian and anti-national bigotry. They could have made O'Connell's repeal agitation triumphant if they had generally and earnestly joined him. They could have recovered for themselves and for their country all that they had lost by the Union. They could have rendered their position impregnable by taking the lead in a thoroughly national and patriotic movement. They could have influenced advantageously for their country and for themselves the proceedings of the restored Irish Parliament. They could have easily acquired the love, the veneration, the loyal support of the Irish people, if they had thus acted with a rational view of the needs and rights of Ireland, and with a vigorous determination to supply those needs and to recover and defend those rights. Thus to act was their clear and obvious

---

\* "How is Ireland to be Governed?" By Poulett Scrope, M.P. London. 1834. (Cited by Isaac Butt in his "Plea for the Celtic Race.")

duty. Had they performed that duty they would have been potent benefactors of their countrymen and of themselves. They would have been the most powerful landocracy on the face of the earth. But instead of performing that duty, they adopted the opposite course, and preferred to become what one of their number styles "the mainstay of English rule in Ireland." And with what result? Instead of being rulers in their own country, they are shaken by a tremendous agrarian agitation. They would have found their own rule a better thing than "English rule in Ireland." They could have now occupied a position of strength, prosperity, and dignity, instead of figuring at Mr. Gladstone's door in the guise of shivering mendicants, begging, cap in hand, for some help to escape from, or at least to mitigate, the difficulties into which their anti-Irish fatuity has led them. Some of them, although rather of the latest, appear to have caught glimpses of the truth. Indeed there was a notable movement in the national direction among them until it was checked by the violent agrarian agitation. While writing these lines I received a letter of which the following passage is an extract. I do not give the writer's name, as the letter is private, but I may mention that he is the heir of an Irish estate, and the descendant of an ancient and distinguished English family, of whom a branch settled here in the seventeenth century.

Why [he asks] do we landlords go about saying we are English? If we are, we have no business here. We are, or ought to be, Ireland's leaders. If we called ourselves Irishmen and acted as such, we could make of Ireland what we liked. But as long as we call ourselves Englishmen and go hiding behind England's skirts, looking for a sympathy we do not get, we shall be considered—what we make ourselves—aliens, and we shall be shot and hated as a foreign garrison, and as we deserve.

This writer's family have always been credited with Conservatism; and it is the experience taught by recent events that has enlightened him as to the necessity of Irish landlords acting, for their own sakes, in a thoroughly national spirit. Had they done so in O'Connell's time or in Butt's time, how different would now be their position! I believe that many landlords have at last arrived at the convictions expressed by my correspondent. Deplorable indeed was the prejudice that withheld them from incorporating themselves with the great body of their nation. By a wiser course they could have easily prevented the agrarian revolt by which they are now confronted. They are certainly answerable for the existence of Parnellism. But it would be most unjust and most untrue to inculcate the whole body of landlords as rackrenters and evictors. There are, and have always been, many landlords who were not only fair, but

[ Vol. CXXIV. No. CCXLVIII. ]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LXVIII. No. II. L L



even generous in their dealings with their tenantry ; but these became unhappily involved in the odium entailed on the whole body by the misdeeds of its numerous evil members.

I have tried to trace the causes of what is called the "Irish difficulty." If Ireland be a difficulty to the English Government, it is a difficulty of their own making. Had they refrained from meddling with our national concerns, had they acceded to Mr. Speaker Foster's request to let Ireland alone, they would have escaped enormous crime, much scandal, and the whole "difficulty."

I do not claim for our people the praise of extraordinary virtue. They have, like all men, their full share of human qualities, both good and evil. But I hold that the ordeal through which they have passed has been eminently calculated to bring out the evil in their natures and to repress the good. From the attitude taken by very many landlords, it is natural that a Land League should be instituted. Its institution was inevitable. There are parts of Mr. Parnell's programme which I wish he could modify. I admire his energy, his fearlessness, his eloquence ; but I conceive that he could have employed these great qualities in a mode that would have attained for his tenant-clients whatever advantage his agitation has procured, without any of the concomitant evils. I execrate the atrocious crimes that have accompanied his agitation, and I execrate the silence that suffered their repetition, unreprieved by the fulminations they ought to have evoked. Several of the murders committed during the past two years had not even the poor pretext of revenge. They were as senseless as they were wicked. Mr. Parnell indeed said they were unnecessary ; but this, so far as I know, was the extent of his censure until the assassination of Lord Frederick Cavendish and Mr. Burke called forth from him a stern denunciation of the murderers. The scandal the crimes created at home and abroad, the deep shame they entailed on our national character, their terrible wickedness, evoked from the Pope the circular in which he condemned them. Any utterance on faith and morals proceeding from his Holiness should of course be received by us Catholics with respectful acquiescence. The crimes of murder, the destruction of property, the barbarous mutilation of cattle, the exhortation, equally immoral and unstatesmanlike, to pay no rent—these outrages were naturally subjects of pontifical denunciation.

The advice to pay no rent was indeed sometimes qualified by adding a condition—"Pay no rent till the suspects are let out of prison." What a lurid light is cast on this advice by the career of James Carey ! That atrocious miscreant was one of the "suspects." For eleven weeks he was imprisoned on suspicion,

and there is not the least reason to suppose that among the other "suspects" that wretch may not have had confederates. "Pay no rent till the suspects are released" in point of fact imported that the tenantry should withhold their payments till James Carey was released to resume his satanic occupation of enlisting assassins and inveigling dupes to be afterwards betrayed by him and hanged. I do not for a moment suppose that the leaders of the Land League thus interpreted their counsel. It is, however, abundantly obvious that, whether they meant it or not, the advice to pay no rent would, if obeyed, have been necessarily productive of popular turbulence and bloodshed. It is one thing to say, Pay no rack-rent; quite another thing to say, Pay no rent at all.

The crimes that preceded James Carey's appearance as a witness had obtained a world-wide notoriety. The paternal interest taken by the Pope in the Catholics of Ireland rendered his intervention natural. But I venture to think—of course with profound respect—that the prohibition to subscribe to Mr. Parnell's testimonial was impolitic. It must be remembered that the tenantry of Ireland had for many generations been the victims of intolerable grievances. The tenants, up to a recent date, had no security against capricious eviction. They felt that the Land Act of 1881 had given them some protection against that pressing danger; and they believed that the legal protection thus obtained was due to Mr. Parnell's agitation. Regarding him, therefore, as their benefactor, it rested exclusively with themselves to show their appreciation of his services by subscribing to his tribute.

Injudicious attempts have been sometimes made to play off the Catholic religion against Irish nationality. The persons, lay or clerical, who made those attempts, may have meant very piously, but their Catholic zeal was a zeal without knowledge. Nationality is in Ireland a strong sustaining power of Catholicity. Divorce religion from the national spirit of this country—represent the Catholic Church in alliance with pernicious alien rule—and you thereby effectively weaken its hold on the affections of the Catholic people. There are a few words in the memorable Roman circular that seem to indicate a very imperfect notion of the real international relations of England and Ireland, but the Pope has now acquired more accurate ideas of the mutual relation between religion and Irish national sentiment.

The brief review I have given of the state of Ireland since the Union, suggests the inference that our vital, indispensable need is self-government. The legislative independence we acquired in 1782, although its full operation was obstructed by a

treacherous and bitterly hostile executive, yet raised our country to a height of prosperity unexampled in its previous annals.

The landocracy of Ireland were scared by their bigotry from throwing the weight of their influence into O'Connell's great effort to benefit *them*, as well as all their countrymen, by the restoration of their national Legislature. They were told by their party leaders that Repeal meant Catholic ascendancy, and that the wrongs inflicted on Ireland in the name of Protestantism would be repaid with interest on themselves. They were credulous enough to believe this calumnious nonsense. There never lived a man more opposed to sectarian oppression of any sort, on any party, than Daniel O'Connell, or more thoroughly impressed with the doctrine that the perfect political equality of all classes of religionists before the law was essential to the vital interests of Ireland, moral and material. The interesting and instructive volume lately issued by Sir Charles Gavan Duffy, entitled "*Four Years of Irish History*" (1845-1849), discloses very plainly the intentions of the Repealers with regard to the landlords. John Mitchell, known to have extreme opinions, wrote of the Young Ireland party, on January 23, 1847: "There are among them Conservatives, moderate Reformers, levelling Democrats; and they do not, as a body, consider the ruin of the landed gentry the best remedy, or any remedy at all, for Irish ills."

Said Meagher :

Let us cherish the rights of *all* our fellow-countrymen—their rights as citizens, their municipal rights, the privileges which their rank in society has given them, the position which their wealth has purchased or their education has conferred, and we will in time, and before long, efface the impression that we seek national power with a view to crush these rights, to erect a church ascendancy, to injure property, or create a slave class.

Duffy, in a private letter to Smith O'Brien, dated October 6, 1847, writes :

If you, or any one else, can induce the gentry to make common cause with the people, we may all be saved; if not, if they go on maintaining English dominion, which robs us now of our daily bread in addition to its old hereditary sins, neither God nor man will tolerate them. . . . But if they will join us, their rights will become part of the national care, and we will be bound to defend them as we would defend Repeal itself.

Another member of that party, the late James F. Lalor, exhorted the landlords to remember

that Ireland is your mother country, and her people your people; that her interest and her honour, her gain and her glory, are counted

as your own; . . . that henceforth you will not be a foreign garrison, but a national guard. . . . Adopt this principle, and you are armed; on it is your safety and your strength. . . . Ireland is yours for ages yet, on condition that you will be Irishmen—in name, in faith, in fact. Refuse it, and you commit yourselves, in the position of paupers, to the mercy of English ministers and English members; you throw your very existence on English support, which England soon may find it too costly to afford. You lie at the feet of events; you lie in the way of a people; and the movement of events and the march of a people shall be over you.

These words were prophetic, as the anti-national landlords have now discovered to their bitter cost. I may venture to recall a similar prediction of my own. In an address to the Irish landlords in 1846 I expressed my belief that Repeal of the Union alone stood between them and ultimate confiscation.

We have now had eighty-five years of Union; that is to say, we have had eighty-five years of varying misery, turbulence, and coercion; and after this prolonged experience of the fruits of imperial rule, we find statesmen recommending as a remedy for Irish ills to hunt the Irish people out of their country.

A policy of exasperation has been often deprecated. The Union is a measure of exasperation; to prolong it is to prolong a policy of exasperation. It is intolerable. Let it be got rid of; let it be consigned to the tomb of extinct iniquities. Let her Majesty, as I have elsewhere said, send us Lord Dufferin as Viceroy with strong powers, and Charles Gavan Duffy as Secretary of State; and Ireland, freed from alien intrusion and alien mismanagement, may resume her career of prosperity, and become a real strength to the empire, instead of a real danger and perpetual "difficulty."

W. J. O'N. DAUNT.

## CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

## THEOLOGY.

THE books noticed in this section have given us a general impression that Protestant theology is taking a new departure, the full significance of which we cannot exactly estimate. Partly, theology is influenced by that reaction against individualism which is so conspicuous a feature of current politics; partly it seems to strive after modes of apprehension—perhaps even after doctrines—which have long been too exclusively the property of Roman Catholicism; partly it is putting forward the claims and assuming the phraseology of science—though as yet its science is usually of a very amateur kind; most of all it is exhibiting, without decrease of faith or reverence, a wider tolerance, a fuller recognition of the legitimacy of diversity of opinion, and a far greater intellectual freedom. These remarks are suggested, in the first place, by the new volume of “The Expositor.”<sup>1</sup> Its title, indeed, is somewhat too narrow; for the theology of General Gordon, the life of Bishop Martensen, and the prospects of the conversion of the Jews, hardly come under the head of “exposition.” As to the more general articles, the Bishop of Durham opens the volume with a paper on the results of recent research upon the New Testament, in which he refers more especially to the new material afforded by archæological discovery; Mr. Cheyne contributes a striking paper on the prospects of the Jews, who will, he thinks, at no distant date embrace Christianity; and Mr. Edmund Gosse and Mr. G. A. Simcox contribute interesting notices of Bishop Martensen and Canon Mozley respectively. Prof. Stokes furnishes a very interesting account of the Fayoum MSS.—written, however, before the deciphering of the supposed fragment of an early Gospel; and Mr. Joseph Agar Beet states what may be called the liberal-orthodox view of the method of theological science. The theologian first extracts from all religions the doctrines of the First Cause, of the distinction between right and wrong, of the Divine Government, and of a future state of retribution (rather a summary generalization this); and then investigates the history of the teaching of Christ as presented especially in the Epistles of Paul and John. He does not therefore start with asserting the infallibility of the Bible (p. 372), and it is only in a certain sense (p. 445) that he holds “dogma.” The form of the magazine, unfortunately, makes the articles look rather brief and scrappy, and its name suggests that there ought to be a good deal more exegesis; what there is is not great in amount, and in part rather devotional than critical. Mr.

<sup>1</sup> “The Expositor.” Third Series. Vol. I. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1885.

Maclaren expounds the Epistle to the Colossians; Professor Godet those to the Galatians and Thessalonians; Professor Fuller the Book of Daniel; and (*longo intervallo*) Dr. Parker declaims on Exodus. The reviews of recent literature, English and foreign, upon the Old Testament, seem likely to be useful. The literary and historical side of the magazine is far stronger than the apologetic, which is represented only by Professor Drummond and his nameless defender, who is even less philosophic than his client. Professor Drummond's own work in the *Expositor* (two papers on the Contribution of Science to Christianity, and a note on Bishop Temple's Bampton Lectures) is less open to precise criticism than his "Natural Law in the Spiritual World," because it is pure generality. We should be glad to know more about that scientific method which "insists mainly on two things—the value of facts and the value of laws," which may be due—though the matter is not worth disputing—to Job and Paul, or to Bacon and Darwin (p. 32), but which at any rate, like all other noble things, has its germ in the Bible (*ibid.*). The question of Special Providences, we learn, must be approached with delicacy, as a family matter with which science is not concerned (p. 37). We should like some clearer account of all this. But we must not, says Aristotle, expect exact science from the rhetorician.

This able little treatise<sup>2</sup> is a continuation of a thesis which obtained for the author the doctorate in the Philosophical Faculty of Berlin. Dr. Pearson, who seems to be an American student of divinity, defends the early date and literal character of the Book of Joel against the attacks of Hengstenberg and Merx. He declines to regard it as either mainly prophetic and allegorical, with Hengstenberg, or purely prophetic and post-exilic, with Merx, but refers it to a time during the reign of Rehoboam, when famine, a plague of locusts (for the locusts are literal), and the invasion of Shishak, and perhaps Hadad of Edom, had combined to distress the people. If the date be so early, of course much can be drawn from the book which will tell against the views of the school of Graf and Wellhausen as to the post-exilic origin of the Levitical cultus; and Dr. Pearson devotes one of the concluding chapters to maintaining the older view, with special reference to these authors. Though some of his historical statements may seem to involve a good deal of assumption (cf. *e.g.* pp. 121, 122), the work is of considerable interest, and, so far as we can judge, is a contribution of some value to the elucidation of an interesting and indirectly very important problem.

It is the fashion of the day to decompose the works of ancient authors into a nucleus of original work, and a number of editorial additions and later interpolations. This has been done by Dr. Voelter for the Apocalypse<sup>3</sup> with, at any rate, industry and learning. He regards

<sup>2</sup> "The Prophecy of Joel." By W. L. Pearson, A.M., Ph.D. Leipzig: Theodore Stauffer. London: Trübner & Co. 1885.

<sup>3</sup> "Die Entstehung der Apokalypse." Von Lic. Dr. Daniel Voelter, Privatdozent der Theologie in Tübingen. 2. Aufl. Freiburg-im-Breisgau: J. C. B. Mohr. 1885.

the nucleus as dating from A.D. 65 or 66, and as the work of the Apostle John, who himself added something to it in 68 or 69. The book was then, he thinks, edited and interpolated in the time of Trajan, and again in 129 or 130 A.D.; at the third editing, about 140 A.D. there were inserted, *inter alia*, the special addresses to the Seven Churches, while to the first belong the dragon with seven heads and ten horns of xii. 1-17, and the whole of ch. xx.; and to the second the two beasts, ch. xiii.—the first of whom is Hadrian, and the second Tib. Claudius Atticus Herodes, who held an official position in Asia Minor when Hadrian went there for the second time (p. 78), and who seems to have been specially active in promoting Cæsar-worship. The number of the Beast is TRAJANUS HADRIANUS (the official title borne by Hadrian on coins and in inscriptions) in Hebrew letters; while another transliteration of TRAJANUS gives the variant 616, preserved by Irenæus—the Epistles to the Seven Churches point to the “monarchic episcopal rule,” of which there is no evidence before the first half of the second century; and the mentions of the Lord’s day and the Nicolaitanes also indicate that this part of the book is post-apostolic (pp. 23 *seq.*, 41). We could only give an adequate account of Herr Voelter’s minute (and very arbitrary) reconstruction by reprinting his summary (p. 190), in which not only verses, but halves of verses, and even clauses of two or three words, are assigned to one or other stage in the work. To most minds there will seem a certain want of reverence in thus disintegrating a sacred book on such very subjective grounds. But the work is only for experts, and they will know best how much reliance is to be placed on this kind of criticism. To the outsider it seems that, with a far more moderate exercise of industry and ingenuity, any book whatever might be plausibly disintegrated, even if it were demonstrably written by one person, *currente calamo*.

De Rosenthal’s little book<sup>4</sup> appeals to a wider public than the title would seem to indicate. The four books dealt with are products of the period between the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus and that of Bethar by Hadrian. They together constitute a kind of Thécodicée, the natural result of a time of suffering; and, except a portion of the first, exhibit almost verbal agreements with the sayings of the teachers of the school of Jabne. The first is a nationalist and democratic protest against the conduct of the upper classes of the Jewish nation after the destruction of Jerusalem; the next two justify the sufferings of the chosen people, partly as a Divine discipline, partly as a test of the faithful, partly as the necessary accompaniments of the end of the world; while the Book of Tobit shows how the powers of evil are divinely overruled for good. The book is a kind of abridged commentary, with some few notes on the difficulties of the text. To professed students of Jewish history or of the philosophy of religion it must be of great value; but it is not without interest even to the general reader.

<sup>4</sup> “Vier Apokryphische Bücher aus der Zeit und Schule R. Akiba’s: Assumptio Mosis; Das vierte Buch Esra; Die Apokalypse Baruch; Das Buch Tobit.” Von Dr. F. Rosenthal. Leipzig: Otto Schulze. 1885.

Of the three ecclesiastical histories before us, Cardinal Hergenrother<sup>5</sup> gives, in this his second volume, the orthodox Roman Catholic view of the period from the death of Karl the Great to the end of the Renaissance; while Dr. Karl Hase<sup>6</sup> and his colleague, Dr. Nippold, in his new edition of the work of K. F. Hagenbach,<sup>7</sup> deal in friendly rivalry with the earlier period. Hagenbach's work comes down to Augustine. Professor Hase's to about a century later. Both the latter works are continuous histories rather than books of reference, and not only contain a vast amount of information—that goes without saying—but possess the merit, rare in German works of great learning, of being nearly as readable as it is possible for a German book to be. In this respect Hagenbach's work stands highest. Dr. Hase deals at some length—after the manner of German writers—with his predecessors in the same field. Either book would, we think, be worth the attention of translators. Cardinal Hergenrother's work, which seems fair enough in tone, also contains a vast deal of matter, and, what we miss in the two former books, a vast quantity of references to authorities. It may be of value to the non-Catholic reader for—what is always the principal subject of interest in such cases—the presentation of the orthodox Roman Catholic view of the mediæval heresies (esp. pp. 456–489).

The next two books may be regarded as protests from within against the rigidity of ordinary Protestantism. Mr. Brown<sup>8</sup> argues that the consciousness of a moral law implies the consciousness of the need of salvation—a need which the Christian Saviour alone can supply. But—and here is the gist of his book—the Saviour does not merely take the place of individual sinners: mankind are one body in Him, and He, as the best and holiest member of that body, suffers most deeply for their transgressions. Sin is corporate; so is punishment, as in minor instances, so in general: but Christ, as the holiest, suffers most deeply from the inevitable punishment. And consciousness of moral union with Him is requisite to secure that peace of mind, the need for which is the moving cause of religion. Repudiating “mysticism,” the author seems to hold distinctly “mystic” views; for certainly the direct inward assurance (p. 63) and the striving after conscious union with God (p. 77 *seq.*) are “notes” of mysticism everywhere. In the insistence on the corporate character of humanity, and on the distinction between conversion and the later stages of the Christian life, he draws attention to truths rather too liable to be overlooked by our individualistic and, so to speak, democratic Protestantism. Unfortunately he becomes vague, or makes large assumptions, just at the most critical

<sup>5</sup> “Handbuch der Allgemeinen Kirchengeschichte.” Von Joseph Cardinal Hergenrother. II. Band. Dritte, verbesserte Auflage. Freiburg: B. Herder. 1885.

<sup>6</sup> “Kirchengeschichte auf der Grundlage akademischer Vorlesungen.” Von Dr. Karl Hase. Erster Theil. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Hartel. 1885.

<sup>7</sup> “Kirchengeschichte der ersten sechs Jahrhunderte.” In Vorlesungen von Dr. K. R. Hagenbach. Vierte Auflage, herausgegeben von Dr. F. Nippold. Leipzig: S. Hirzel. 1885.

<sup>8</sup> “The Moral Unity of Humanity the Key to the Evangelic Theory.” By R. Brown. Third edition. London: Elliot Stock. 1885.



points. It is scarcely necessary to assume a special moral intuition to account for the universality of sacrifice (p. 5); and we cannot understand his presentation of the Atonement (pp. 66-68). Still, his work deserves commendation as an effort to develop the philosophical side of the central doctrine of Christianity.

Here<sup>9</sup> we have another sign of the reaction against Individualism in religion. This book is a short and powerfully written protest against intolerance in religious bodies, and separatism in their members. Subscription to a creed, the author holds, by no means implies belief in it; for belief is an active state, proportioned to knowledge; and the large majority of believers in a religion, nay, even of its teachers, hold their beliefs half consciously, and must not be expected to do more: indeed, they have not the requisite knowledge. Subscription to a creed then implies passive acceptance of it—agreement not to controvert it. And those who cannot any longer accept some articles of the creed will do best not to controvert it, but to remain members of their religious body, obedient to the social instinct which is the basis of all churches, and working together for the common good. Instead, then, of many diverging religious bodies, we shall have but one—with members most of whom, as now, believe passively: the active-minded minority will hold divergent creeds, but will agree to sink their differences in order to co-operate for the common good. Just as the social problem now is, not whether nobility or middle-class or proletariat shall be supreme, but how all classes shall be combined into one society; so the religious problem is not which sect shall triumph, but how all sects shall best co-operate.—That the Articles of the Church of England are articles of peace, not of belief, is a very old doctrine; but we cannot go as far as the writer. How is belief ever to be kept alive without active discussion? and how far is discussion likely to be active if it is purely academical? It would indeed be strange if in an age of democracy and popular education, when all other subjects are incessantly discussed, theological subjects are to be allowed to rest. An undiscussed opinion, as was said by Mr. J. S. Mill, is held as a mere dead prejudice. Nor do we believe that co-operation for the common good can proceed from anything but a strong faith, and such a faith, we think, is best kept alive by discussion and its results. There was once, indeed, a church whose beliefs were all passive. But it was the Church of Laodicea.

We hardly know what to make of this book.<sup>10</sup> It is very "sound," very ponderous; there is a look of close reasoning about it; and it is about a century and a half behind the present state of religious philosophy. A reason that exercises itself on the Infinite and Unknowable, and really finds out a great deal about it; a materialist who believes in Evolution misbegotten of Necessity and Chance (p. 98); a First Cause which is shown by Reason to have been intelligent (p. 97); and a

<sup>9</sup> "Subscription and Belief." By the Author of "The God-Man." London: Elliot Stock. 1885.

<sup>10</sup> "The Faith of the Unlearned." By "One Unlearned." London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1885.

Living Principle or Thing which organizes and vitalizes the constituent matter of the Material Organism (p. 137), seem to suggest that some eighteenth-century apologist has risen from the dead, and is sadly puzzled by the theory of Evolution (p. 144) and the law of Continuity. But this being premised, we may say that the book may be of some use to the persons for whom it is written. If a great deal of it is "metaphysical" in the Comtean sense—which we may briefly describe, by saying that there are a great many abstract nouns each beginning with a capital letter—it does at least afford some kind of synthesis, which may pass muster in the present chaotic condition of apologetics: the only wonder is, that the unlearned should want so much abstract reasoning. The author is at his best in the chapter on Vicarious Atonement, and at his worst where he is dealing with the conclusions of modern science. But we admit that we may have failed to follow his reasoning with sufficient closeness.

It is characteristic of the German mind that, while the author of "Subscription and Belief" deals with Belief in two or three pages, and the Unlearned One disposes of it in a few lines, Herr Schlatter<sup>11</sup> devotes 585 pages to an exhaustive examination of the Hebrew and Greek terms for Faith, with their cognates, and to the content of the notion in the theology of the Jews, the works of Philo, the Gospels, and the various Epistles respectively. Of course, this involves some padding; but that is inevitable in the works of Docenten; and Herr Schlatter shows a historical sense, and especially an appreciation of the value of the study of Polybius for the due understanding of the Pauline Epistles, that would quite win the heart of Professor Freeman. We wish we could give some account of his results, but we have been wholly unable to discover them. However, the Hague Society for the defence of Christianity have awarded him a prize; so we presume they have been more fortunate.

Mr. Haweis celebrates the twentieth year of his ministry at St. James's, Marylebone, by issuing a seventh volume of his sermons.<sup>12</sup> The first division, "Amo," gives genial and excellent advice on babies, their food, clothing, and education; brides ("there is nothing so conceited as a bride, and often nothing so unintelligent"), divorce, dust-bins, historical studies, mothers-in-law, old maids, water supply, and other important if not precisely theological subjects. In fact, "it palpitates with actuality," and we have no doubt his congregation are all the better for what we may call his authoritative journalism. For the purposes of this section, however, the second part is more interesting. Here Mr. Haweis expounds the attitude of the progressive Broad Churchman towards the Christian creed. To the substance of Christianity he holds fast; but the form must change from age to age. To provide for this he demands (p. 304) the repeal of the Act of Uniformity, the abolition of subscription, liberty to make certain

<sup>11</sup> "Der Glaube in Neuen Testament." Von A. Schlatter, Lic. Theol., Dozent in Bern. Leiden: E. J. Brill. 1885.

<sup>12</sup> "Winged Words." By the Rev. H. R. Haweis, M.A. London: Wm. Isbister, Limited. 1885.

omissions in the services, and a consequent freedom of statement in the pulpit. But Mr. Haweis, without all this, obviously says and does exactly what he pleases. Need he ask for more? We ourselves fear that a Church which virtually comprehends everything may so far lose its personality as to become that Church without Passion or Intellect which he so strongly condemns (p. 309), and to which some foreign Protestant Churches occasionally seem to approximate. The religious sense of mankind will then no doubt find other outlets, as it did when, for instance, the older Paganism had lost its hold on the educated classes in Rome. But neither then nor now are these of the most satisfactory kind.

Mr. Moncure Conway's farewell charge<sup>13</sup> comments upon the mutual tolerance and forbearance, the clearer understanding of each other's views, which is growing up between Christians and the more serious and earnest of those who have rejected Christianity. It is to some extent an illustration of all this; indeed, it is at times not easy to see that Mr. Conway is essentially different from a very Broad Churchman. But then all non-Christians are not like Mr. Conway. And somehow, these new religions of Humanity, whether in South Place or Fetter Lane, do not seem to have much missionary power. They are too diluted for the sustenance of man, and of those manly and warlike virtues whose day—*pace* Mr. Conway—is not quite over yet. The doctrine preached at South Place is, in a human point of view, all that can be desired; but it is eminently the religion of those who are already cultivated, earnest, and good. Mr. Haweis preaches the separation of the form of Christianity from its unchangeable spirit. Mr. Conway does his best to separate them; and the spirit, now disembodied, is confined to a circle of believers narrower even than the elect of the straitest sect of Calvinists.

This immense and exhaustive book<sup>14</sup> is interesting in a great many ways. The author attempts, not merely to give a bare list of the works prohibited by the Roman Catholic Church, but to afford sufficient particulars of the more important of them to indicate the reasons which prompted the prohibition, and to gauge its influence on the development of the literature on the subject—an influence sometimes, as he points out, unexpectedly large (vol. i. 6). Besides this he deals with the prohibitions of books by the Mediæval Church prior to the publication of indices—prohibitions which, as he remarks, show the wide divergence of the Church of later times from her ancient practice (p. 8). Of the immense knowledge of literature displayed in the work we need not speak. As a bibliography it is invaluable. But it contains a great quantity of curious information of very general interest. It will probably surprise most people to learn that Oliver

<sup>13</sup> Farewell Service and Discourse delivered at South Place Chapel, Finsbury, London, May 17, 1885. By Moncure D. Conway, M.A. A Charge to be kept at South Place. London: E. W. Allen. 1885.

<sup>14</sup> "Der Index der Verbotenen Bücher." Von Dr. Fr. Heinrich Reusch, Professor an der Universität zu Bonn. Bonn: Cohen & Sohn. Vol. I. 1883. Vol. II. 1885.

Goldsmith's "History of England"—the schoolbook of our great-grandfathers—is on the Index, as is also Whately's "Logic:" (ii. p. 1033); that most of Bentham's works are there also, and that J. S. Mill is represented by one book, his "Political Economy" (ii. p. 1036). Again, any one who is interested in the prohibition of Aristotle or the Talmud, or Marsilius of Padua; or, to come to recent times, in the literature of the earlier Socialists, such as Fourier and Cabet (ii. p. 1180)—St. Simon (strange to say) escaped the notice of the Church; in the Gallican controversy (p. 1099 *seq.*), in the Kulturkampf (p. 1171), in the life of Rosmini, whose works have recently been brought under the notice of English readers, or in that strange development of Mariolatry which makes the Virgin all but a fourth person in the Trinity, and regards her as corporeally present in the Eucharist (*sic*, p. 1156), will find a great deal of curious information here. The industry and research shown in the book, and the clearness with which the matter is presented, cannot be too highly praised. The book seems, indeed, more than German in its thoroughness.

We have also to notice two volumes of the translation of the Sacred Books of the East<sup>15</sup>—one consisting mainly of rules for the Buddhist monks, the other bearing upon the Persian creed, and containing, *inter alia*, a curious (but to us unintelligible) attack on Christianity, dating from about the sixth century A.D.; a Roman Catholic defence of Christianity by a German ex-professor,<sup>16</sup> which seems to be of considerable value, though it displays a somewhat promiscuous reading and an acquaintance with natural science which, so far as we can judge, is only second-hand, and which attacks Materialism, Pantheism, and Pessimism, but not, at least expressly, Agnosticism. Are there no Agnostics in the land of Kant? We have also before us a Roman Catholic work on Boethius,<sup>17</sup> which aims at proving him to have been a Christian; Mr. Finlayson's<sup>18</sup> good but far too moderate criticism on Professor Drummond; an attempt, earnest and devout in tone,<sup>19</sup> to show that the Scriptures give us reason to believe that the wicked may have salvation offered to them in the future world, repeatedly, until all are saved; a little book<sup>20</sup> of Sunday School lessons, distinctly Unitarian in character, which contains a good deal of already popularized antiquities in a handy form,

<sup>15</sup> "The Sacred Books of the East." Vol. XX. "Vinaya Texts." Part III. "The Kullavagga, IV.—XII." Translated by T. W. Rhys Davids and H. Oldenberg. Vol. XXIV. "Pahlavi Texts." Part III. Translated by E. W. West. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1885.

<sup>16</sup> "Apologie des Christenthums." Von Franz Hettinger, D.D., Ph.D. Erster Band (1. u. 2. Abth.). Freiburg: B. Herder. 1885.

<sup>17</sup> "Boethius u. seine Stellung zum Christenthum." Von Dr. SS. Theol. August Hildenbrand. Regensburg: G. J. Manz. 1885.

<sup>18</sup> "Biological Religion." An Essay on Natural Law in the Spiritual World. By T. Campbell Finlayson. Manchester: Brook & Chrystal. London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co. 1885.

<sup>19</sup> "The Gulf Bridged." London: Elliot Stock. 1885.

<sup>20</sup> "The Childhood of Jesus." By W. C. Gaunet. London: Sunday School Association. 1885.

but is rather too American in style for English readers; and, last but not least, some hitherto unprinted sermons of Luther,<sup>21</sup> which we regret we cannot notice at length.

## PHILOSOPHY.

THE translation of Lotze's "*Mikrokosmos*," begun by the late Miss Elizabeth Hamilton, daughter of Sir William Hamilton, has since been completed by Miss E. E. Constance Jones, of Girton College, and now appears in two large volumes.<sup>1</sup> Miss Jones has also revised Miss Hamilton's part of the work, which ends at p. 659 of vol. i. in the middle of a paragraph, and has numbered the sections (left unnumbered in the original), "and in the Table of Contents referred the headings to sections and the sections to pages, and supplied a few headings where they seemed to be required." The style of the translation is remarkably uniform, and has none of the stiffness frequent in translations from the German; in fact, it does not produce the effect of a translation, but of an original, and at the same time the translating has been done with extreme care for accuracy. English readers may now study Lotze in what is generally considered his greatest work, as well as in the latest systematic exposition of his thought—the recently translated "*Logic*" and "*Metaphysic*"—and in the briefer form of the "*Outlines*," the translation of which is proceeding in America. The appearance of the "*Mikrokosmos*" in English seems to be an appropriate occasion for offering some remarks of a critical nature on Lotze's philosophical system as a whole. The central principle of Lotze's philosophy, kept in the background in his earlier scientific work, but set forth in all its bearings in the "*Mikrokosmos*," is that "the sphere of mechanism is unbounded, but its significance everywhere subordinate." The consummation of philosophy would be the demonstration that there is "only *one* thing: only the one real power appearing to us under a threefold image of an end to be realized—namely, first some definite and desired Good, then, on account of the definiteness of this, a formed and developing Reality, and finally in this activity an unvarying reign of Law." This, however, is only "a confession of philosophic faith;" and there is a "decisive and altogether insurmountable difficulty which stands in the way of its being carried out scientifically"—the old difficulty of "the existence of *evil* and of *sin* in Nature and in History." Notwithstanding the impossibility of fully justifying it, the "philosophic faith" must still be retained. "Let us therefore alter a little the

<sup>21</sup> Ungedruckte Predigten D. Martin Luthers. 1528-1546. Leipzig: Fr. Wilh. Grunow. 1885.

<sup>1</sup> "*Microcosmos*: an Essay concerning Man and his Relation to the World." By Hermann Lotze. Translated from the German by Elizabeth Hamilton and E. E. Constance Jones. In 2 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1885.

canon of Leibniz, and say that when there appears to be an irreconcilable contradiction between the omnipotence and the goodness of God, there our finite wisdom has come to the end of its tether, and that we do not understand the solution which yet we believe in." This admission is certainly an example of philosophic candour, but at the same time the final decision to hold to a faith that cannot be justified is a revelation of the fundamental weakness of Lotze's philosophy considered as a system. This weakness is the fixed determination from the beginning to subordinate intellectual to ethical ends. It is only on questions of physical and psychological science that Lotze consistently works out a purely intellectual view. The "mechanical philosophy" which would be the ideal completion of this view seems to him opposed to "the philosophy of the feelings;" and it is conceived as the problem of a higher philosophy to mediate between these opposite theories of things. Not only is this so, but the philosophic impulse from which proceeds the attempt to arrive at a synthesis that shall explain Nature as a system of means directed by a personal being to the realization of moral perfection by other personal beings is itself conceived as in its essence ethical. Aesthetic ends, indeed, are also referred to among the ends towards which the philosophy of the feelings desires to find that Nature is working; but in general it is the ethical that is opposed to the purely intellectual impulse. Now it is of course true that we require a philosophy of art and a philosophy of ethics as well as a theory of knowledge. And the "mechanical theory," if by this is understood philosophical materialism, must be rejected as inadequate; for, even if we regard philosophy as nothing but a synthesis of the sciences, psychology would find itself excluded from the materialistic scheme. But Lotze means more than this. He means that philosophy ought to give satisfaction to a religious consciousness that remains attached on the emotional side to Christianity. There is no need here to dispute the proposition that truth which does not satisfy the emotions cannot be the highest kind of truth; on the ground chosen by the "philosophy of the feelings" itself, we may find something to urge in favour of those doctrines that have been supposed to give least satisfaction to emotional needs. Consider, for example, the influence of philosophy on the higher kinds of poetry. Of those poets who have been directly influenced by philosophy, how many have been attracted by systems that have proceeded from a desire to justify traditional beliefs? We might easily find poets who have been directly inspired by traditional beliefs, but not by the philosophy that tries to compromise with them. On the other side there are the examples of Lucretius, who found inspiration in the materialism of Epicurus; Goethe, who was profoundly influenced by Spinoza's rigid determinism and absolute denial of ends in Nature; and Shelley, who derived the philosophical element of his thought in great part from the "destructive metaphysics" of the eighteenth century. This seems to show that the more a philosopher detaches himself from traditional forms of faith and the emotions associated with them, the more likely is his

philosophy to result in some new satisfaction of the emotions by means of art. Why should it be different in the sphere of practice? The example of Spinoza is sufficient to prove that a high ethical ideal is not only consistent with, but may proceed from, a philosophy that starts with the determination to remain uninfluenced by any emotion but the intellectual emotion of contemplation of truth. We have laid stress on this point because it is exactly the fundamental weakness of Lotze's system—the admission, as one of its determining elements, of sympathy with the traditional theory of things, that some regard as its strength. This weakness does not prevent Lotze from being a very important thinker. His great predecessor Leibniz, to mention only one example, was also the author of a theodicy, and even tried to work the details of theology into his philosophic scheme. But it is necessary to insist as strongly as possible that philosophy must not be subordinated to practical needs, even when they take the elevated form of desire for an ideal satisfaction of the ethical sense.

The volume on "Practical Philosophy" has just been added by Professor Ladd to his series of translations of Lotze's "Outlines."<sup>2</sup> The translation has been made from the second German edition of the *Dictate* of Lotze's lectures, as delivered in the summer session of 1878. Attention is drawn by the editor to the special importance of the volume in relation to Lotze's philosophy, to the suggestiveness of its discussions, especially of the question of freedom of the will, and to Lotze's "rare and delicate tact in discovering the weak places of Rigorism and Eudæmonism in morals." The restoration of a qualified eudæmonism may indeed be selected as the feature that distinguishes Lotze's ethical philosophy from that of Kant. In opposition to Kant's purely formal conception of morality, he contends that "there is such a thing as moral judgment of conduct only upon the assumption that this conduct leads to pleasure or pain. But to this conscience joins the further truth, that it is not the effort after our own, but only that for the production of another's felicity, which is ethically meritorious; and, accordingly, that the idea of benevolence must give us the sole supreme principle of all moral conduct." This moral doctrine is developed by means of a contrast between pagan and Christian views of the aim of the individual:

To antiquity, man appeared without any manifest attachment to a coherent system transcending his earthly life, pre-eminently as a creature of Nature, whose aim—not so much moral as altogether natural—could only consist in bringing all the bodily and spiritual capacities with which he is endowed by Nature, to the most intensive, and at the same time harmonious, cultivation. . . . Just the opposite of this, under the influence of Christianity, the conviction is formed that, strictly speaking, every man is called only to the service of others; that the effort to concentrate all possible excellences in one's own person is, at bottom, only a "shining vice;" but true morality consists only in the complete surrender of one's own self, and in self-sacrifice for others. . . . Nothing, therefore, remains for us to do but to supplement the ancient self-

<sup>2</sup> "Outlines of Practical Philosophy." Dictated Portions of the Lectures of Hermann Lotze. Translated and Edited by George T. Ladd, Professor of Philosophy in Yale College. Boston: Ginn & Co. 1885.

satisfaction, without surrendering æsthetic culture, by having all the powers acquired by such culture placed at command for the accomplishment of a life-aim in accordance with motives of benevolence (pp. 58-60).

"On endeavouring, in the next place, to define such a life of action in relation to the external world," two things are to be rejected: first, "every ascetic direction;" and secondly, "the ancient preference for a dianoëtic life," "the assertion that a merely contemplative life is preferable to a life of action."

The maxim that the "truth" should be sought for its own sake and without other immediate motive has, of course, its good meaning in the sum-total of our culture. Although it is just as correct to say that the problem of reproducing over again in consciousness what is just precisely as it is, has not of itself the very slightest moral value. We are right in being very enthusiastic for science only on account of the fact, partly that we discern the usefulness of its impulse for the sum-total of human life so well as to renounce all claim to see a special application for each individual truth, and partly that the general character of truth, its consistency, and the manifoldness of the consequences that follow with certainty from a few principles, places before our very eyes an actualization of what we ought to attain in the moral world by our own conduct. Certainly, therefore, nothing but the practical life of action is the scene which we ought to seek for the exhibition of our powers (pp. 61-62).

From the accentuation of certain ideas in these passages we may perceive already what the author's theoretical philosophy is likely to be. And, as Professor Ladd remarks in his Preface, "an intelligent apprehension of the points of view taken by" Lotze's system "cannot be gained at all without recognition of their ethical character." The present volume is very well adapted to show the influence of Lotze's ethical personality on his philosophy. It may be mentioned that this volume is not a merely general discussion of ethical principles, but in chapters v. to viii. of the "Second Principal Division" (pp. 67-150) contains a development of them in relation to the needs of the present day, ranging from the subject of "Marriage and the Family" to "The State."

In four not very large volumes Herr Spir offers to the public the results of a life of philosophical activity. The last two volumes of his "Collected Writings" have just come to hand.<sup>3</sup> The author, in his Preface to the fourth volume, tells us that henceforth he will not publish anything more; he has said all that he has to say, and he leaves it to others to develop further, or to refute, his conclusions. His ideas certainly deserve all the attention he claims for them, although his expectation of the effect they are to produce will seem immoderate to readers who are sceptical as to the influence of philosophy on practice. If Herr Spir's writings have been neglected, the loss is on the part of the public, for his style is extremely clear and readable, his ideas have originality, and in an age and country of voluminous philosophical writing (see vol. iv., p. 210, where he

<sup>3</sup> "Gesammelte Schriften." Von A. Spir. Dritter Band.—"Schriften zur Moralphilosophie." Vierter Band.—"Schriften vermischten Inhalts." Leipzig: J. G. Findel. 1885.



includes himself in his condemnation of the verbosity of the age), the compression to which he has submitted his development of them is in itself no small merit. Those who desire that a philosopher should have first of all what Mr. Matthew Arnold calls "negative lucidity" will find nothing to complain of in Herr Spir. In alluding, for example, to the passage quoted above from Lotze's "*Mikrokosmos*" about believing in a solution of the contradiction between the omnipotence and the goodness of God which we cannot comprehend, nothing can be more decisive than his comment. "We have no right to believe in a solution which implies a logical contradiction; we ought rather to see in it the proof that we have proceeded from a false supposition" (vol. iv., p. 76). Herr Spir's positive view may be indicated by the phrase of M. Renan, that God is the "category of the ideal;" but this position is arrived at as the result of a philosophical deduction, and forms part of a connected system of metaphysics. The starting-point is that of the Kantian philosophy, but the author has not been uninfluenced by the English empirical school, and in his metaphysics he has attempted a conciliation of the principles of both. His general conclusion is summed up in the following three propositions:—(1) "The things of this world have no true being of their own," (2) "The permanent existence of all things, as well of ourselves as of the external world, rests on the illusion which makes them appear as if conformable to the norm of our thinking (as substances)," and (3) "The truly essential, the normal being of things, lies outside experience, and stands to their empirical character in a radical contrast." Nature, the world of empirical existence, is a world of evil and illusion; the life of man, too, as individual, is perishable, filled with evils, and could not continue to exist without illusion. This illusion is beginning to be detected; hence the pessimism of the present age. Yet pessimism is not the true and definitive theory of life. Pessimism fails to consider that the reason why we are able to condemn life as in its empirical content meaningless is that we carry in ourselves the "norm" by which to measure it. The divinity within us is manifested equally in the moral principle and in the principle of truth, which are both set over against the physical principle, the source of error and of evil. The fundamental defect of most theology and philosophy has been the identifying of the higher principle, the "norm," with a principle of force; the conception of God as a cause active in external Nature, instead of an internal principle opposed to Nature. "Thus humanity wanders on as with bound eyes, misunderstanding itself, striking into a thousand paths of error, a plaything of physical forces, and a slave of physical laws. Then, and then only, will the rule of might or of Nature in the spiritual life of humanity take an end and the rule of the norm begin, when man shall come to the consciousness that between the physical and the moral a radical contrast subsists, that God, the highest norm, is no physical force, no natural principle. This rule of the norm will be the true kingdom of God on earth." There are two periods of human history—the rule of might, which is the past, and the rule of right or of the norm,

which is the future. Not that the dualism of the physical and the moral will vanish ; but man will at least be conscious of his true nature, and his mind at least will not be darkened and disfigured by the lower, external power. This doctrine is not such an absolute Manichæanism, with the human spirit for the good principle and Nature for the evil principle, as might at first appear. "As in the bosom of humanity, in spite of all errors, the higher impulse maintains itself alive and active, so also in the bosom of Nature." For the inner principle of Nature is in its essence related to man, and man himself is a product of Nature, although he now "rises above all Nature in consciousness." In some passages the author almost reaffirms the Socratic doctrine that virtue is a kind of knowledge. "All hindrance and all error in the life of humanity," he says in one place, "came through want of insight." His real position is that "the effort after true insight is as divine as the effort after moral perfection." The want of recognition of this he regards as the fundamental defect of Christian morality. Here it is instructive to compare his views with those of Lotze, for in spite of the contrast there is also considerable resemblance between them. Not the least interesting chapters of the "*Mikrokosmos*" are those in which the ancient and the modern ideals of life and the characters of the ancient and modern periods are contrasted. Lotze sees as clearly as Herr Spir that in the transition from ancient to Christian civilization the world has lost much ; that the Christian doctrine of self-sacrifice even in its best form has carried with it a tendency to think little of the æsthetic and intellectual development of the individual in comparison with the service of others ; and that this has produced in modern times a devotion to the mechanism of life as if it were an end in itself and a sacrifice of symmetry of development, and of individual perfection to external results. On the other hand, Herr Spir recognizes that "the view of the ancients was one-sided," that their leisure was obtained by a solution it was impossible permanently to accept,—that of slavery,—and that the doing of work serviceable to the community forms part of the moral ideal. But he sees that the ancients, after all, had the root of the matter, and that the duty of the moderns is now to keep in view internal perfection and happiness as the end, and no longer to lose sight of it in an endless mechanical accumulation of means. In this, perhaps, he does not so much differ from Lotze. It is rather in the placing of insight, of a true view of things first, as a condition of right action, and of the intellectual on an equality with the moral ideal, that the difference on his part consists ; but this difference is a sufficiently important one.

Dr. J. Clark Murray's "*Handbook of Psychology*"\* is a very good introduction to the subject. The author tells us that it was nearly completed before he was "aware that Mr. Sully and Mr. Greenleaf Thompson were engaged on the contributions which they have recently made to the literature of psychology," and the book had passed out of

---

\* "*A Handbook of Psychology.*" By J. Clark Murray, LL.D., F.R.S.C., John Frothingham Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy, McGill College, Montreal. London : A. Gardner. Montreal : Dawson Brothers. 1885.

his hands before either of those works was published. If he had been able to consult them, it would probably not have made much difference to his own work, except the addition of a few more references; for he has read widely in the literature of his subject, both English and foreign, and has systematized his knowledge in a way that shows grasp of it from his own point of view. And his book, being much smaller than either of those mentioned and written for less advanced students, has a place and a value of its own independent of any rivalry with them. His point of view, besides, is different from that of Mr. Sully and Mr. Thompson, who may both be classed as of the English empirical school, although Mr. Sully has been influenced much, and Mr. Thompson scarcely at all, by modern German schools of psychology. Dr. Murray may be described as of the Scotch school very much modified by Kantian and Hegelian influences. But he has a clear view of the distinction between psychology and philosophy, and only indicates his philosophical opinions in one or two chapters where he has to discuss such questions as the general nature of knowledge and the freedom of the will. In this separation of scientific from metaphysical questions his book resembles Mr. Sully's rather than Mr. Thompson's. Even where he indicates his philosophical point of view, his treatment is more historical and critical than dogmatic, although he makes it plain that his own theory is that which "starts from self-conscious intelligence as the primary fact of all science, sees in the realities of the world no meaning except as constructions of intelligence, and therefore refuses to find in these realities the source of intelligence itself" (pp. 275-276). That there is so much practical coincidence with the treatment of the subject by writers who start from the opposite point of view is evidence of the scientific character of psychology.

#### POLITICS, SOCIOLOGY, VOYAGES AND TRAVELS.

**"IMPERIAL FEDERATION"**<sup>1</sup> by the Marquis of Lorne, is the first of a new political series, in size and general form not unlike our old friend the "English Citizen." The editor of this series, Mr. Sydney Buxton, neatly summarizes the distinction between his enterprise and that of Mr. Craik. The latter "speaks of things as they are—this series will deal with them as reformers think they should be." The new series is therefore essentially political and controversial. Mr. Buxton promises that though "political," it will not be "party." We are not clear in what sense the promise is meant or how it can be kept. But the "intention" of the series is a good one—namely, "to place within reach of the general public, at a very cheap rate, short volumes dealing with those topics of the day which

<sup>1</sup> "Imperial Federation" ("Imperial Parliament" series). By the Rt. Hon. the Marquis of Lorne, P.C., K.T., G.C.M.G., Late Governor-General of Canada. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co., Paternoster Square. 1885.

lie within the range of practical politics." We cannot throw too much light upon such questions. The democracy, stumbling along in the dark and taking fearful "leaps" in it, is not a prospect to rejoice the hearts of thinking men. We therefore welcome this series and venture to congratulate the editor on the able contributors—"specialists" in their respective subjects—whose assistance he has secured. The idea of a federal union between Great Britain and her Colonies for mutual defence against whatever threatens any portion of the empire, and for the advancement of all legitimate common interests, is one of the grandest, but, unfortunately, at present one of the vaguest, that politics has ever given birth to. Its grandeur no one will deny. Its vagueness appears the moment we try to grapple with it, or to trace its outlines. Its most enthusiastic advocates declare their inability to do more than suggest minute modifications of the present condition of things. They walk by faith rather than sight. One short step onward is all that they can see to take, but that once taken, they believe they will be able to see their way to another and another. Paradoxical as it may seem, this vagueness is, in our opinion, one of the most hopeful signs in the movement. It proves that the idea is the outcome of a deeply felt want, the remedy for which is not yet clearly perceived. Had the idea first burst upon the world embodied in an elaborate imperial constitution professing to be complete in all details, we should have been justified in suspecting that the alleged want was made to order to fit in with an ingenious idea. As it is there can be no doubt about the genuineness of the feeling that modifications in the relations between the mother country and her colonies are desirable. We believe that they will come, and that they will be the more satisfactory when they do come, if they are discussed in the temperate unassuming tone which marks Lord Lorne's contribution. Probably his experience as Governor-General of Canada has convinced him of the necessity of moving slowly and tentatively, and, above all, of letting "the impulse towards advance come primarily from the great colonies themselves." That the colonies should look with suspicion on proposals which necessarily interfere in some degree with their freedom of action, and impose some financial burdens, however slight and however compensated by gain in other respects, is not to be wondered at, especially when such proposals emanate from the mother country. But these suspicions will gradually disappear when it becomes evident that there is no disposition to force any change whatever upon any unwilling colony. The chief merit of Lord Lorne's little work is that, while pointing out, in a very general way, the mutual benefits likely to follow from judicious advances in the direction of federation, it is careful to avoid exclusive advocacy of any particular pet method of accomplishing the desired result at a single step. The idea is not yet sufficiently matured, the public mind is not yet sufficiently familiarized with it, to allow of any precise formulation. But although Lord Lorne has no complete scheme of federation he has a clear colonial policy, which will favour and foster every tendency towards federation. He has, moreover, a very definite proposal,

which, indeed, is not his own, Lord Grey having suggested it in the *Nineteenth Century* of April, 1879. This proposal, briefly stated, is that the Agents-General, or other representatives of the Colonial Governments, should form a consultative council with which the Secretary of State should discuss all matters of common interest. Lord Grey proposes that these representatives should be made at the same time members of the Privy Council. Lord Lorne suggests, as an alternative, that they might be *ex officio* members of the Imperial Parliament, with power to take part in debates and make "interpellations," but *without a vote*. Lord Lorne calls attention to the very interesting and satisfactory experiment of appointing a High Commissioner for the Dominion of Canada, and placing him in direct communication with foreign courts, with whose ministers he commenced negotiations as the coadjutor of the British ambassador. This "new departure" in Colonial policy has given the utmost satisfaction to Canada, and is warmly supported by our own Colonial Office. Its importance as the first step towards the incorporation of colonial statesmen in the machinery of Imperial Government cannot be overrated. An excellent chapter is devoted to pointing out the precise amount of federation which already exists. A few well-chosen statistics and a good index complete this successful little volume.

The works of Friedrich List,<sup>2</sup> as his translator reminds us, have exercised a powerful influence on the commercial policy of continental nations, especially Germany, and probably upon America also. Although his "National System of Political Economy" was written more than forty years ago, when the condition of things was in some important respects different from what we see at present, his work is still probably the most complete statement of the case in favour of protection to manufacturing industries under certain conditions. The author, whatever may be said of the use to which he has put his materials, is at least entitled to an acknowledgment of the industry and ability with which he has pursued his investigations and collected a great mass of suggestive materials from the commercial history and statistics of all civilized nations. The work is divided into four books. Book I. consists of a series of very able and interesting sketches of the commercial history of each of the European communities which have attained to importance—from the tiny but powerful maritime republic of Amalfi, a thousand years ago, to the vast territorial empire of Russia in our own day. Of course the author finds in each history something to point his own pet moral. But, interesting as his conclusions are, they cannot and ought not to weigh much with us who cannot examine for ourselves the circumstances under which a given policy is alleged to have produced certain beneficial or disastrous effects. Students of this particular question are, indeed, bound to examine and disprove his conclusions if fuller historical research does not support them. But the subject is too wide for us to trouble

<sup>2</sup> "The National System of Political Economy." By Friedrich List. Translated from the original German by Sampson S. Lloyd, M.P. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1885.

ourselves about it here. As history this part of his work is highly interesting, but as the basis of a theory of economics we decline to accept its authority. The portion of his work which chiefly concerns us is Book II., which contains his theory of protection. His aim is twofold—first and chiefly to show the vital necessity of home manufactures to each independent “nation;” and, secondly, to prove that in a country which at the present day does not possess such manufactures they can only be created by judicious protection. On the former point we apprehend that the difference between List and his opponents is one of degree only; for no one probably denies the great advantages of manufacturing industries to a country which can make them pay. On the second point his arguments appear to be very vague and unsatisfactory; in fact, he can hardly be said to have any arguments beyond the rhetorical question—How else can they make way against the skill and strength of old-established manufactures unless protected in the home market from the crushing competition of the latter?

List is very severe upon “the school”—by which he appears to mean what we sometimes call the orthodox school—that of which Adam Smith was the founder, and which takes its stand on universal free-trade. List argues, with much ingenuity, that there are in effect two sciences—*cosmopolitical* economy, which is a hypothetical science based on an assumption of the federation of the world, the obliteration of international barriers of all sorts, and a state of perpetual peace; and *national* political economy, which takes account of the actual conditions of nations and their mutual relations. “The school” have mixed up these two, and have applied to existing facts the conclusions which are true only in the hypothetical case. We must, he says, discriminate “between true political and national economy (which, emanating from the idea and nature of the nation, teaches how a given nation, in the present state of the world and its own special national relations, can maintain and improve its economical conditions) and cosmopolitical economy, which originates in the assumption that all nations of the earth form one society living in a perpetual state of peace.” He maintains that “the school” have made this assumption and based their whole system of universal free-trade upon it. Indeed it must be admitted that some of the arguments and expressions of Adam Smith, J. B. Say, and others, lend colour to this charge. Were this assumption in harmony with fact, then indeed, he admits, “the principle of international free-trade seems to be perfectly justified;” and he appears to look forward to a time when the facts will correspond to this assumption, and to think that that time will be hastened by the recognition of the blessings which universal free-trade would then bring. That, however, “under the existing conditions of the world, the result of general free-trade would not be a universal republic, but, on the contrary, a universal subjection of the less advanced nations to the supremacy of the predominant manufacturing, commercial, and naval power, is a conclusion for which the reasons are very strong, and to our views irrefragable.” “In order to allow freedom of trade to operate naturally, the less

advanced nations must first be raised by artificial measures to that stage of cultivation to which the English nation has been artificially elevated." The overwhelming influence which he assigns to England is very flattering to British vanity. The whole of this chapter (XI.) is worth reading even if no other part is read. It is worthy of remark that while insisting on the great benefits England has derived from her past protective policy, he also insists that the time had come for her to abolish protection. English "fair-traders" will, therefore, find no direct countenance of their demands, but with ingenuity they may be able to turn some of his arguments to account.

The greater part of this Book is devoted to an exhaustive examination of the economic, social, and political effects produced by the manufacturing power, which is the power of producing wealth to an indefinite amount. Without native manufactures even agriculture cannot receive its highest development or win its highest rewards. In his Third Book List examines the principles of the various "systems" of political economy; and in the Fourth and last Book he applies his conclusions to international politics. He sketches a vigorous commercial policy for his own country, and a corresponding imperial policy for all Germany, which is very interesting to study in the light of events that have happened since he wrote. In many respects the policy actually carried out by Prince Bismarck is remarkably similar to that sketched by List forty years ago, and it is not unreasonable to suppose that the Chancellor is indebted to the exile for many of his ideas and arguments. If this be so it gives an importance to those grand ideas of continental Teutonic federation which List has so ably expounded and eloquently urged, but which the Chancellor has not as yet at least openly declared for. English students of German policy will be grateful to the translator for the opportunity of reading in their own language a remarkable book, the work of an original thinker, whose posthumous influence on recent history has probably far surpassed his most sanguine expectations and shows no sign of having even yet exhausted itself.

Mr. Auberon Herbert has surpassed himself in his latest publication.<sup>3</sup> It is difficult to treat seriously a political teacher who asserts that all government revenues (whether central or local) ought to be left to voluntary not compulsory payments. That it would be an excellent state of things if every citizen were absolutely impartial in estimating his obligations to the State, and perfectly willing to contribute his share without compulsion, we admit. But does Mr. Herbert's experience of human nature lead him to conclude that this would be so? And if not, what would the consequences be? Mr. Herbert need hardly have told us that Mr. Spencer is "opposed" to these views of his advanced disciple.

<sup>3</sup> "The Right and Wrong of Compulsion by the State. A Statement of the Moral Principles of the Party of Individual Liberty, and the Political Measures Founded upon Them." By Auberon Herbert. London: Williams & Norgate. 1885.

The greater part of "Russian Projects against India"<sup>4</sup> has appeared before in the form of articles written for various magazines during the last eight or nine years, and has not therefore been prompted by the recent complications. They have been, as the author assures us, "all written with one object"—namely, to show that Russia's Central Asian expeditions have always been undertaken, not for the sake of an improved frontier, nor for commercial purposes, "but simply in order to place Russia in a position to threaten, and, on a fitting opportunity, attack India." This is frank, and we are bound to say that for a Russophobe Mr. Edwards is singularly fair. His narrative is truthful and straightforward, and he indulges in no abuse of Muscovite treachery, though he records at least one signal instance of it. But from Mr. Edwards' own narrative we arrive at a conclusion quite opposed to that he wishes us to draw. For it seems indisputable that the earlier expeditions—almost all, down to the last thirty years—were planned for entirely different reasons. Some had for their object the liberating of Russian subjects, more than a thousand of whom were at one time held in slavery of the harshest kind at Khiva; others were prompted by the hope of opening up trade with Khiva and Bokhara—a vain hope based on exaggerated notions of the importance of such a trade. It is not until we come down to the time of the Crimean war that an invasion of India was seriously contemplated. Colonel Duhamel's memorandum, presented to the Emperor Nicholas in 1854, states that "the present war imposes upon Russia the duty of showing how she can attack England in her only vulnerable point—in India—and thus force her to assemble so great a force in Asia as to weaken her action in Europe." The same policy is energetically urged in Skobelev's famous "project," written in 1877. He says, "A knowledge of this region and its resources leads inevitably to the conclusion that our presence in Turkestan, in pursuance of Russian interests, is justified solely on the ground of an endeavour to solve the Eastern question in our own favour from this quarter." But, whatever Russia's motive may be at present, it seems clear from Mr. Edwards' most interesting narrative that she would never have been where she is had not other and less sinister motives existed. Apart from their political importance the story of these expeditions is of great military and general interest. The hardships endured by the Russian troops under Perofski, and later under Kauffmann, prove the metal of the Muscovite soldier.

"Self Help v. State Help"<sup>5</sup> is a report of the speeches delivered at the third annual meeting of the Liberty and Property Defence League. The principal speech is that of the chairman, the Earl of Pembroke. Sir Edmund Beckett made a vigorous speech, in which, in spite of the non-party character of the League, he managed to introduce a good deal of party slashing. Lord Brabourne was, as usual, weak. From

<sup>4</sup> "Russian Projects against India, from the Czar Peter to General Skobelev." By H. Sutherland Edwards. With Map. London: Remington & Co. 1885.

<sup>5</sup> "Self Help v. State Help." London: Liberty and Property Defence League, 4, Westminster Chambers. 1885.



these and other speeches the speech of Lord Pembroke is honourably distinguished by its logical strength and its moderation of tone. He believes the change in public opinion which has called the League into existence is chiefly due to two causes: first, "the natural reaction from the creed of the last generation," a reaction which is explained by that principle of human nature which makes men blind to the benefits, and impatient of the drawbacks, of a certain course when they have followed it for long; and, secondly, the transfer of political power to classes whose ignorance and circumstances expose them to the temptation of trying to better their condition by the apparently short and easy method of legislation. Granting the effect of these causes, the explanation of the phenomenon is hardly complete. We find no admission of the possibility of errors having been discovered in "the creed of the last generation," nor any hint that creeds sometimes become unsuited to the altered circumstances of their devotees.

We regret that we have never seen a copy of a lecture on the Land Question, given by Mr. C. A. Pyffe<sup>6</sup> last November at the Oxford Reform Club. We had heard of it certainly, through Sir Charles Dilke's favourable allusion to it, but we thought the world had forgotten it. The Parliamentary Committee of the Liberty and Property Defence League have, however, rescued it from the obscurity from which a Cabinet Minister incautiously raised it for a moment by a passing and, as we think, most unfortunate allusion. The little pamphlet in which the said Committee comment on this lecture is a delicious morsel, compounded of the most cutting irony, the bitterest sarcasm, relentless ridicule, and, unfortunately, a good strong dash of spite. Of the merits of the lecture as a whole we are unable to form an opinion. But we frankly confess that if Lord Bramwell and his co-committee-men have not distorted the author's meaning, by fastening on disjointed sentences, their malicious humour has managed to make him look very silly. "Land" may supply Mr. Pyffe's opponents at the next election with a good many sharp stones for pelting "the candidate," but it is not a serious contribution to the Land Question, which, in spite of "Land," is a "burning" question, and must be grappled with seriously.

One of the best of the "English Citizen Series" is Sir E. F. Du Cane's "Punishment and Prevention of Crime."<sup>7</sup> It is humiliating to Christian civilization to contrast the stupid brutalizing cruelty of the treatment of prisoners—convicted or only accused—which prevailed throughout Christendom almost to our own day, with the enlightened humanity, pagan though it was, which marked "the punishment and prevention of crime" by the Romans. "They (the Romans in Britain) seem to have arrived at a level of humanity and good order which was not again touched in England till long after the

<sup>6</sup> "Land." By the Parliamentary Committee of the Liberty and Property Defence League. London: 4, Westminster Chambers, S.W. 1885.

<sup>7</sup> "The Punishment and Prevention of Crime." ("English Citizen Series.") By Colonel Sir E. F. Du Cane, K.C.B., R.E., Chairman of Commissioners of Prisons, &c. &c. London: Macmillan & Co. 1885.

present century had begun." They would have been almost as much horrified as we are ourselves at the awful accounts we read of prisons and hulks a hundred years ago, or even less, for it was in 1813 that Mrs. Fry first visited the female prisoners in Newgate, and startled respectable people by her descriptions of "the begging, gaming, fighting, singing, dancing, and dressing up in men's clothes in this 'hell above ground.'"

Probably no other function of the State was so badly performed as its police and penal administration until quite recently; and in no other of its functions has Government during the present century made such "leaps and bounds" along the path of genuine reform. Whoever doubts this will doubt no longer after perusing this little book; or if he does, let him compare some of the old Prison Reports with recent Reports, and then go see for himself what a modern prison really is. A most satisfactory feature of prison reform is, that decrease in crime has kept pace steadily with mitigation of the severity of punishments.

Prison statistics present some interesting problems. Why, for instance, should the age at which crime is most frequent be from 25 to 35 in males? Why should it begin and end later in females? Why is serious crime so much less frequent in proportion to lighter crimes among women than among men? Sir E. Du Cane gives a highly interesting and truthful account of the principal punishments of the Middle Ages. More interesting and more instructive is the historical sketch of "Gaols in former times." The chapter on "Modern Prisons" is not so sensational; but it is good because, if for no other reason, the author is dealing with what he knows better than perhaps any other man alive. The history of transportation and its gradual development into the present system of penal servitude is well told. The modes of exercising police supervision and the preventive system as applied to juvenile offenders in reformatories and industrial schools, are also described. Finally, there is an index. We hope we have said enough to convince our readers that they will find in this little volume ample return for any time and money they may spend on it.

There is not much to interest the reader in "Justice and Police,"<sup>a</sup> but there is a good deal of information which will make the reading of a newspaper more interesting, and which every citizen ought to know. The subject is a very large one, and when treated as briefly as the plan of the series renders necessary, the mass of details becomes dry. By the "justice and police" of a country we are to understand all "those institutions and processes whereby that country's laws are enforced." It is therefore necessary to give some account of all our courts of law, civil and criminal, their constitution, functions, and methods of procedure; the magistracy, paid and unpaid, town and country; and the agents by whom the orders of courts and magistrates are carried out. Mr. Maitland's chief difficulty must have been to know what to omit from his account, and he has, on the whole, met

<sup>a</sup> "Justice and Police," ("English Citizen Series.") By F. W. Maitland. London: Macmillan & Co. 1885.

this difficulty successfully. He has confined himself, as a rule, to explaining the things a man must know if he is to read his newspaper reports intelligently, only occasionally relieving dry details of procedure by short historical sketches of the institutions under notice. The county magistracy and the Courts of Chancery are thus treated in a very clear and interesting manner. The various civil tribunals, from the County Court to the House of Lords, are first described; then come bankruptcy, magistrates, the constabulary, arrest, and the various proceedings before magistrates. Finally, we have a rather inadequate account of the criminal courts and a criminal trial. This volume is not as satisfactory as its predecessors, but it meets a want.

The title which Lady Verney has given her two volumes of miscellaneous magazine articles<sup>9</sup> is likely to mislead people. There are twenty articles (republished from the *Contemporary* and *Fraser*) on all sorts of subjects, and of these only five profess to be "mainly concerned with peasant properties in Germany, France, and Switzerland." But even in these five there is hardly anything about peasant properties, and this is especially true of the two first articles, which relate to Germany and the South of France. The articles on Auvergne and Brittany are decidedly the best of the five. In them we do find some real information about peasant properties, whereas in the other two there are indeed some "jottings" about peasants, but hardly a word about their properties or land systems. These articles carry us pleasantly through many of the most interesting, but also best known, tourist tracks of Germany and France; and Lady Verney describes gracefully and truthfully what presented itself to her observation—grand-ducal schlosses, peasant châteaux, royal picture galleries, hotels full of "obnoxious" American children, mountain scenery, anecdotes of the war—in fact, everything that we expect to find when an intelligent and observant globe-trotter takes to printing. There is nothing worthy of special remark in these articles, but they are pleasant, easy reading, and, above all, truthful. The author is most anxious to impress upon us the well-known fact that German and French peasant-proprietors are, for the most part, extremely poor, and that *morcellement* is carried to a ruinous excess amongst them. From which, apparently, she concludes that peasant-proprietorship must be a mistake and a delusion in all countries, especially in Ireland.

Mr. Arthur Crump has presented to that portion of the public "whose minds are open to conviction on the subject of politics," a volume<sup>10</sup> of considerable size and inconsiderable merit, consisting chiefly of feeble comments on the rival pretensions of Whigs and Tories. From the title of the book one might expect something in the nature of an analysis of the influences which determine men's

<sup>9</sup> "Peasant Properties, and other selected Essays." By Lady Verney. Two vols. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1885.

<sup>10</sup> "A Short Inquiry into the Formation of Political Opinion, from the Reign of the Great Families to the Advent of the Democracy." By Arthur Crump. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1885.

political opinions. The reader who indulges in any such expectation will be disappointed.

Mr. Bonar's "*Malthus and his Work*"<sup>11</sup> contains a good deal of scattered information which students of that well-abused man may find helpful. The plan of the book is, however, in our opinion, most unsatisfactory. It is far too long to be read as an 'essay on Malthus' "Essay." As an exposition of Malthus' theory it is too disjointed, too much interrupted by criticisms, answers to critics, and biographical items. Moreover, we are often unable to tell whether we have before us Mr. Bonar's own views or his presentation of Malthus' views. The book is a dish of hash—part Malthus, part Bonar—and it is often impossible, without reference to other sources of information, to tell from which of these ingredients the flavour of any particular morsel is derived. Mr. Bonar is painstaking and laborious. Had he compressed his remarks into one essay of moderate length, we have no doubt it would have been admirable.

We cannot, in our limited space, do justice to the unorthodox, but fresh and suggestive essays of "*Hibernicus*."<sup>12</sup> To examine the errors, as we hold them to be, into which he has fallen in his criticisms of the generally received views on the subject of Free-trade, for instance, would take us too far afield. The general tone of his essays may be described as one of dissatisfaction with the received arguments and conclusions from them. He does not so much directly deny the conclusions as throw doubt upon the cogency of the arguments. His criticism is destructive. Much of it misses its mark. Yet it is all suggestive. While strenuously opposing Mr. Henry George's views on most points, "*Hibernicus*" thinks, nevertheless, "there are branches of political economy on which he has thrown an important light." He holds questionable views as to the "sacredness" of property—at least when it exists in the form of "unearned wealth." (By the way, what wealth is unearned?) Two of the best of the essays are on subjects not intimately connected with economics—"Disestablishment" and "War." Many of his illustrations from Irish economic conditions are new, and his essay on "*The Principle of Population*" may be read in connection with the last noticed work.

The inaugural address of Professor Marshall,<sup>13</sup> who has succeeded the late Professor Fawcett at Cambridge, aims at giving a short account of the province of the economist as Mr. Marshall understands it, and of what it seems to him Cambridge may best do in it. He thinks the nature of the change of front which economics has undergone is due to "the discovery that man himself is in a great measure a creature of circumstances, and changes with them." Contrast with this Lord

---

<sup>11</sup> "*Malthus and his Work*." By James Bonar, M.A., Balliol College, Oxford. London: Macmillan & Co. 1885.

<sup>12</sup> "*Essays on Economical Subjects*." By "*Hibernicus*." Dublin: E. Ponsonby, 116, Grafton Street. London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co. 1885.

<sup>13</sup> "*The Present Position of Economics*." An Inaugural Address given in the Senate House at Cambridge. By Alfred Marshall, M.A., Professor of Political Economy at the University of Cambridge, &c. &c. London: Macmillan & Co. 1885.

Pembroke's explanation of another phase of the same phenomenon, cited in our notice of "Self Help v. State Help" (*ante*). Ricardo and his followers "regarded man as, so to speak, a constant quantity, and gave themselves little trouble to study his variations." And this led to their treating labour as a "commodity," making no allowance for the workman's human nature, and the interference of this element with the mechanical regularity of the forces of supply and demand.

Readers of this REVIEW will recollect a noble essay, lofty and earnest in tone, cogent in reasoning, pure, strong, and graceful in style, which appeared in our number for July, 1884, under the title of "The Christian Harem." This and four other "studies" equally admirable, by the same author, on the same theme—the laxity of the current moral code and the deadly evils resulting from this laxity—are now published in a neat little volume.<sup>14</sup> "The New Godiva" sounds a note, not, we gladly admit, unheard before by those who had ears to hear, but certainly unfamiliar to the public ear, and rarely heard so clear and penetrating, so full, harmonious, and sustained—that men should be pure as well as women, and that women should be courageous as well as men. To some this precept will appear an idle truism, as though the author had said "men should be honest as well as women, and women should speak the truth as well as men." Others—the greater number probably—will look upon it as a council of perfection. To both these classes of persons these admirable essays may be specially recommended. The former will find, perhaps to their astonishment, what a gulf separates the precept from the practice, even where to the superficial glance there is no visible separation; the latter will feel ashamed to talk about perfection in connection with the putting away of practices with which such a mass of hideous selfishness, injustice, and cruelty is inseparably bound up. We can well believe the author when he (or is it she?) declares that "they were written with a degree of care, and, I may add, of emotion, which, I suppose, seldom attend the efforts of the magazine writer, as commonly understood." It is not easy even to *read* them without emotion. Yet there is no cheap sensationalism, no namby-pamby sentimentalism about them; no pathetic stories of ruined lives; no appalling statistics. The writer appeals to principles alone. Happily he is able to enforce them with rare literary skill, inspired by intense earnestness, chastened by perfect self-control. The strength and delicacy of his touch proclaim a master's hand. We venture to say there is not a line that could offend the purest or gentlest—and it is to the pure and gentle of both sexes the author appeals to do what in them lies towards establishing a higher standard of purity, and a gentler, juster treatment of the deeply wronged victims of man's selfish impurity and woman's thoughtless indifference. The time is ripe for such an appeal. The spirit of true chivalry is reviving, and in a hundred different forms is slowly but surely sweeping away the worst forms of the oppression of the weak by the strong, of the woman by the man. It is breathing a new

<sup>14</sup> "The New Godiva, and other Studies in Social Questions." London: Fisher Unwin & Co., 26, Paternoster Square. 1885.

spirit into our current maxims. "We have hitherto for the most part said to a man, Be brave. We say to him now, Be pure. We have hitherto for the most part said to a woman, Be pure. We say to her now, Be brave."

The author points out how curiously unsettled and conflicting is the state of public opinion in regard to relations other than lawful between the sexes, and lays particular stress upon two ways of promoting the cause of pureness. "They are, first, to insist upon more openness and honesty in regard to the actual state of things; second, to endeavour to alter the existing attitude of women towards the whole question." The second essay, taking for its motto "*Puissance oblige*," is a powerful appeal to the spirit of chivalry on behalf of "a class of persons to whom its teaching has as yet been very imperfectly applied"—the persons, "whom Mr. Lecky, in a flourish of sublime nonsense, has dubbed the priestesses of humanity." The "Study," which gives its name to the volume, is in the form of a dialogue between two brothers, one of whom endeavours in the usual way to discredit the so-called "shrieking sisterhood," while the other triumphantly defends them. In the fourth essay the author insists that the principle of the Harem still exists in our midst; and the concluding essay consists, mainly, of an admirable examination of Mr. Henry James' plea for Zola.

We have before us the two first volumes of the International Library of Social Science.<sup>15</sup> They are written with ability and marked earnestness. We need not be Socialists to find in them much to approve of and sympathize with, for almost every social reformer has something in common with the thorough-going Socialist. Vol. I. is an attempt to link the "woman question" with the general question of Socialism. "The so-called women's question is only one side of the whole social question, only in connection with each other can the two questions reach their final solution." The placing of men and women on an equal footing in the present economic organization of society only leads, say the Socialists, to a fiercer and more ruthless competition. But in "the new order" women will be freed from their economic dependence on men, to which is due their present social slavery and a multitude of social immoralities.

Volume II. embraces the whole field of Socialism. There is very little purely economic reasoning in it. We find first "an analysis of the phenomena of the era in which we are living;" then a sketch, by anticipation, of "the social order which will probably develop itself from the present system;" after that "an outline of the political and legal machinery of that new order," and an attempt to predict the social effects which follow; finally, an account of the manner in which

<sup>15</sup> International Library of Social Science. Vol. I. "Woman in the Past, Present, and Future." By August Bebel. Translated from the German by H. H. Adams Walther. Vol. II. "The Co-operative Commonwealth: an Exposition of Modern Socialism." By Laurence Gronlund. English edition edited by George Bernard Shaw. London: The Modern Press, 13, Paternoster Row, E.C. 1885.

the revolution is likely to be accomplished in England and the United States.

The craving for bigness, with which we sometimes twit our American cousins, appears to extend to the subjects they choose for study.<sup>16</sup> Mr. Brown's object is, he tells us, "to obtain as deep and adequate a conception of society as possible, the society of any township or any country of the world of to-day or the whole world of society in the past." From the fact of his presenting the public with his thoughts and observations on this subject, we must assume that Mr. Brown has arrived at such a conception, and that it is fairly "deep and adequate." What his conception is, or what value such an attenuated generalization could have even if it were clearly formulated, we must leave our readers to discover for themselves, hoping they may be more successful than we have been.

The original contributors of ghost-stories and fairy-tales to the *Gentleman's Magazine*<sup>17</sup> may have had a dim notion that their labours of love might some day turn out to be useful as well as entertaining. But they could scarcely have foreseen that in the material they were storing up would be found, by a more scientific generation, the traces of a race of pre-historic inhabitants of these islands—true fossil history. "Comparative study of this subject (fairy beliefs) brings out the fact that the fairies, a small pigmy race, represent traditions of that early aboriginal people, short and dark, who preceded the Aryan occupation of Europe." Already, therefore, fairy-tales have passed from the nursery to the workshop of the scientific student, and the able editor of "*The Gentleman's Magazine Library*" has accordingly given them a prominent place in his new volume as an important division of traditional lore. We have in previous numbers of this REVIEW expressed our appreciation of the useful work Mr. Gomme is doing in publishing in such a convenient form a classified collection of the chief contents of the *Gentleman's Magazine*. Few men are equally qualified for this laborious work, requiring, as it does, so extensive an acquaintance with many subjects which lie outside the sphere of pure literature, and so much judgment in classifying what is worth keeping and omitting what is worthless. So far as our limited acquaintance with that vast treasure-house of miscellaneous objects permits us to judge, the editor has come up to the high standard of our expectations. From "Fairy Beliefs" Mr. Gomme leads us on to "Legends and Traditions," which, as he points out, are sometimes erroneously classed under the former heading. He suggests an interesting problem for folk-lorists, namely, why it is that so few folk-tales have survived in popular tradition in England as compared with most other European countries.

<sup>16</sup> "The Life of Society : a General View." By Edmund Woodward Brown.

<sup>17</sup> "*The Gentleman's Magazine Library*. Being a classified collection of the chief contents of the *Gentleman's Magazine* from 1731 to 1868." Edited by George Laurence Gomme, F.S.A. "English Traditional Lore; to which is added Customs of Foreign Countries and Peoples." London : Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row, E.C. 1885.

The next section of the present volume contains "Prophecies, Dreams, and Ghost Stories," an interesting study at present, thanks to the energetic investigations of the Psychical Research Society, who no doubt will welcome these old friends. Finally, we have a selection of "Customs of Foreign Countries." The connection between this and the former sections is not obvious to the vulgar mind, and Mr. Gomme need not have apologized for pointing out that the customs, superstitions and myths of a civilized people are often the "survivals" of customs and ideas still flourishing in all their primitive vitality in savage countries. This volume completes the series dealing with folk-lore. The next, we are promised, will comprise Archaeology.

Mr. J. B. Crozier<sup>18</sup> must be a wag of the first order. For calm self-assertion his "Introductory" pages are quite unrivalled; and for sublime nonsense we have never met the equal of his remaining four hundred and forty-three pages.

Mr. Edmond Kelly's "French Law of Marriage"<sup>19</sup> is a useful work. It must often happen that a French citizen wants to marry in England or America, or an English or American citizen in France. So entirely different is the spirit of the French law of marriage from that of the corresponding law of England or the United States that citizens of the latter countries are apt to find themselves in a dilemma, which leads to the most serious consequences, if they have not conformed to the numerous requirements of the French law. It is not generally an easy matter to find out exactly what these requirements are. Mr. Kelly has removed that difficulty. Students of private International Law will find this branch of the subject treated by Mr. Kelly in a clear and concise manner.

The last half-year has produced a large number of books of travel, but none of striking merit.

We are indebted to Mr. J. Theodore Bent<sup>20</sup> for a valuable study of the folk-lore of the Cyclades, and some good notes on the archaeology of those islands. Mr. Bent has had the good fortune to be amongst the first to study the manners and customs of the Greeks in these islands as they are, with a view to comparing them with those of the Greeks as we read of them in the classics.

The Cyclades are particularly rich in folk-lore, and in customs and beliefs which were once common to the whole Greek world, but have completely disappeared centuries ago from the mainland. The truth of this statement is attested by almost every page of Mr. Bent's work. There are special reasons why these islands in particular should have preserved their ancient customs and beliefs. Owing to their insignificance and unproductive soil they have escaped alike the incursions

<sup>18</sup> "Civilization and Progress. Being the Outlines of a New System of Political, Religious, and Social Philosophy." By John Beattie Crozier. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1885.

<sup>19</sup> "The French Law of Marriage and the Conflict of Laws that arises therefrom." By Edmond Kelly, M.A., of the New York Bar, Licencié en Droit de la Faculté de Paris. London: Stevens & Sons. 1885.

<sup>20</sup> "The Cyclades; or, Life among the Insular Greeks." By J. Theodore Bent, B.A., Oxon. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1885.



of the barbarians who overran the mainland of Greece, the Italian influence which pervaded the Ionian Islands, and Islamism which swamped Asiatic Greece and the neighbouring islands. Mr. Bent went the right way to work. The presence of a lady—his wife—must have greatly facilitated that “personal intercourse with the islanders in all grades of society, at their work and at their board,” which he found so invaluable in helping him to understand their life and superstitions. Two winters is none too long a time for such a study, but the travellers evidently worked hard, and the result is a highly satisfactory scholar-like work. They visited most of the islands, and the author carefully describes what he saw and heard. There is very little “padding” in the book, and very little that could be omitted without loss.

Notwithstanding the attention attracted to Tonquin and Anam during recent years by the doings of the French, the English public probably knows very little indeed of the countries in question or their inhabitants. Nor is this to be wondered at, for there is little of interest in either country or people, and nothing to attract travellers, settlers, or traders. But a well-written book by a shrewd observer can make even Tonquin interesting for a few hours; and Mr. Scott, a well-known special correspondent, has succeeded in doing it.<sup>21</sup> The records of Tonquin reach back to the year 2879 B.C., from which time down to about 200 B.C. the country was independent. The Chinese then conquered it, but in the fourteenth century were driven out, the emperor, however, continued to exercise a kind of suzerainty which has lasted down to the present time. Marco Polo was the first European visitor, but we do not hear of any European settlements there until late in the seventeenth century, when the Dutch and French attempted to get a footing for trade. Then, just before the outbreak of the French Revolution, Louis XVI. of France concluded a treaty with an exiled claimant to the throne, by which France was to receive certain provinces in return for assisting the exiled claimant. France lacked either the inclination or the power to claim the promised provinces until the year 1858, since which time she has been making spasmodic efforts, as the humour seizes her, to extend her authority. Mr. Scott tells us the country is fertile, and the climate, “on the whole, excellent.” But the people are simply repulsive, if Mr. Scott’s account of them is anywhere near the truth.

They have no moral sense at all. . . . They are as incapable of any great vices as they are of any great actions. . . . There is no nation on earth more depraved than the Anamese. . . . They never take their clothes off even to sleep, and when on state occasions they dress, they simply put the fresh—one cannot reconcile oneself to calling it the clean—suit on top of the old dirty one. There it remains till it falls to pieces. . . . King Tu Duc once issued an order that members of the Court were not to search for vermin in one another’s hair in the presence of the French officers.

---

<sup>21</sup> “France and Tongking. A Narrative of the Campaign of 1884, and the occupation of Further India.” By James George Scott (Shway Yoe). With Maps and Plans. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1885.

The bulk of Mr. Scott's book is taken up with the narrative of the campaign of 1884. There is little in it to interest civilians, but much to excite contempt for the combatants on both sides.

Whatever justification there may be for the military aggression of the French in Tonquin, it is difficult to see any extenuating circumstances in their proceedings in Madagascar.<sup>22</sup> The more we know of the Hovas—the leading race in the island—the more we are disgusted with the bullying attitude assumed by France. All accounts agree that the Hovas are a peaceful, industrious, progressive folk, who have shown a really remarkable aptitude for a higher civilization. Mr. Shaw is only one of many witnesses who all say the same thing. He, it will be remembered, is the English missionary whose illegal and insulting treatment by Admiral Pierre, two years ago, created such excitement in England. His account of the proceedings of the French is very full and on the whole fair. A certain tone of bitterness is discoverable, but it is not to be wondered at when we recollect how he was treated, and that, although a missionary, Mr. Shaw is a man and an Englishman, with an Englishman's weaknesses as well as virtues. Having lived for fourteen years in the island, during which time his calling brought him constantly into contact with all classes of the Malagasy, he is able to give a very interesting, and, so far as we can judge, a truthful picture of the country, its resources, and its people. Slavery exists, but in a mild form, and is gradually disappearing. The origin, or origins, of the principal races lead to some interesting speculations. In the two final chapters, some facts about the flora and fauna of Madagascar are collected.

After reading such volumes as the two last noticed, in which our own countrymen describe the policy of the French in Tonquin and Madagascar, and their methods of carrying out that policy, it is a pleasure to turn to the pages of an able and patriotic Frenchman<sup>23</sup> who is labouring to induce his countrymen to desist from a course of action suicidal to its authors and productive of nothing but misery to its victims. Readers of the WESTMINSTER REVIEW will be pleased to find their old acquaintance, M. Yves Guyot, raising his powerful voice against the colonial policy pursued by M. Ferry. They will find that he handles politics as ably and eloquently as he did the social evils which we have lately seen him combating so successfully.

M. Guyot protests energetically against any attempts to found a colonial empire. France has never gained anything, but, on the contrary, has lost much, by such attempts. Her aims are impossible of attainment, and the actual consequences of her efforts are costly and dangerous. "The partisans of *la politique coloniale*," says M. Guyot, "declare that its principal end is to multiply Frenchmen in every part of the globe, and with them the French language, French ideas, and

<sup>22</sup> "Madagascar and France. With some Account of the Island, its People, its Resources and Development." By George A. Shaw, F.Z.S. London: Religious Tract Society. 1885.

<sup>23</sup> "Lettres sur la Politique Coloniale." Par Yves Guyot. Paris: C. Reinwald. 1885.

French civilization." The Anglo-Saxons are covering the earth, and will soon be a hundred millions. Are Frenchmen to rest content with their little corner of Europe and their paltry thirty-seven millions? M. Guyot has little difficulty in showing that the policy hitherto pursued by France will not mend matters. A glance at a good atlas shows that France has no colonies, and cannot obtain any, within that temperate zone where alone are found such climates as Europeans can live and reproduce themselves in. Algeria and New Caledonia are exceptions, but they are only just within that zone; and as a matter of fact the French population in these countries is only maintained by constant immigration. As for Algeria, M. Guyot calculates that every French colonist there has cost the lives of four French soldiers, and requires still two soldiers to protect him. "One colonist for four corpses and two soldiers!"

So much for the "expansion of the race" theory! Nor, according to M. Guyot's statistics, are French colonies of any use as outlets for French industry and commerce, the exports of France to her colonies being only one-fifteenth of her exports to foreign countries. M. Guyot goes through the whole list of arguments in favour of colonies, and shows that for France at least they are illusory. His arguments against colonial empires are based chiefly on facts which do not hold in the case of England, but some of his criticisms may well make Englishmen wince.

Mr. Chalmers has done some good work in exploring New Guinea,<sup>24</sup> a country which, considering its great size, its reported natural wealth, and its proximity to Australia, is singularly little known. Recent political events will probably lead before long to a great advance in our acquaintance with the interior, which at present may be said to be absolutely unknown. The present volume gives, in a popular form, the results of Mr. Chalmers' observations and his experience of the natives. The missionary work in New Guinea is not uninteresting.

Captain Kennedy's "Sport, Travel, and Adventure,"<sup>25</sup> belongs to the most interesting class of books of travel—those, namely, that record voyages undertaken in connection with some work, as opposed to those undertaken for pleasure or aimless curiosity. It is a simple sailor-like record of what the writer saw, heard, observed, and did during the three years that he commanded H.M.S. *Druid*, as senior officer on the coast of Newfoundland, or cruising in the West Indies.

His most important duty appears to have been to look after Newfoundland, where the complications arising out of the French fishing rights require constant watchfulness and great delicacy and tact on the part of both English and French authorities. Captain Kennedy gladly acknowledges that he has never found these qualities wanting on the part of the French naval officers.

<sup>24</sup> "Work and Adventure in New Guinea, 1877-1885." By James Chalmers and W. Wyatt Gill, B.A. London: The Religious Tract Society. 1885.

<sup>25</sup> "Sport, Travel, and Adventure in Newfoundland and the West Indies." By Captain Kennedy, R.N., with illustrations by the Author. Wm. Blackwood & Sons, Edinburgh and London. 1885.

He relates some amusing "cases" which came before him as a justice of the peace (magistrates being scarce round the coast), and gives us many pathetic instances of the poverty and hardships of the poor Newfoundlanders. They are a hospitable, warm-hearted, simple folk. Captain Kennedy found them always ready to further his sporting expeditions, which may account for the startling assurance that he loves Newfoundland, and that its climate is "second to none in point of salubrity." But now we come to some incredible revelations, which we shall reproduce as far as possible verbatim. In the course of her cruise the *Druid* twice visited Haiti, where, "in consequence of information received," he made inquiries which led to the discovery of "a condition of affairs so peculiar that I shall neither be surprised nor offended if the reader gives me credit for a lively imagination." There is, it seems, "a secret society called the Voudoux or Serpent Worshippers, which pervades all classes of blacks, from the President downwards." It has its temples, priests, and festivals.

The people are called together by beat of drum, usually at midnight. . . . On the first night a priest sacrifices a cock at the altar, the blood being drunk warm. . . . On the second a goat is sacrificed, and the blood drunk as before. On the third night the orgies continue. Then a little child is brought in; the child's throat is cut by the priest, the blood handed round and drunk warm; the body is then cut up and eaten raw. . . . A class of professional child-stealers exist, whose business it is to supply the victims. . . . In this manner it is computed that many hundreds of children are annually butchered. . . . But it is not only on these occasions that children are devoured; the negro would appear to have a natural relish for human flesh, and women have been known to eat newly-born children. Human flesh has been sold in the markets, and it is said that a lard is prepared from human fat and sold in the same way. . . . But these things, horrible though they are, sink into insignificance beside the fact that it is by no means an uncommon occurrence for corpses to be disinterred in order to feast upon the putrid remains."

It is difficult to believe in the existence of such revolting depravity in a semi-civilized community, self-governing, having diplomatic relations with other civilized countries, and possessing "schools, churches, and laws modelled, as they claim, after those of France," to which country this island belonged until about eighty years ago. Yet Captain Kennedy appears to be a sober-minded man, and he mentions cases of cannibalism which came under his own notice. Moreover, Sir Spencer St. John, in his "Black Republic" declares that those allegations are "nearly all probable." If they are true, what a lurid light they throw upon the bastard civilization of "the Black Republic!" What a problem for the sociologist! Captain Kennedy traces these abominations to the ancestors of the present inhabitants, the Mondongoes, who were brought originally, he says, from the Congo, and were cannibals, serpent-worshippers, and famous secret-poisoners.

Mr. Gordon Forbes's<sup>26</sup> recollections of his experiences as a civil servant in an out-of-the-way part of India are as pleasant light

<sup>26</sup> "Wild Life in Canara and Ganjam." By Gordon S. Forbes, Madras C.S. (Retired). London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1885.

reading as anything of the kind we have lately come across. They have no pretension to scientific or historical interest whatever, but they are briniful of incidents, chiefly of a sporting character, told with humour and terseness, so that they never tire one. The "wild life" of such an official was something for poor, tame, stay-at-home pen-drivers to sigh for. The illustrations are unique, we believe, for their colouring. Nothing approaching them is known to us, unless it be the illustrations of "Struwel-Peter," that delight of German and English nurseries.

Colonel Tcheng-ki-Tong,<sup>27</sup> moved by compassion for the amazing ignorance of Europeans about his native country, has undertaken to depict for Europeans the ideas and customs and institutions of his countrymen "as they really are," in the hope of dispelling the errors and prejudices to which the hasty observations of travellers have given rise. We have read his book, or rather the translation of it, with real interest, and have learned a good deal from it. The Chinese arguments in favour of ennobling the parents instead of the children of a man who is thought deserving of honour, have always appeared to us unanswerable, and they are well put by the "Colonel." It seems that some at least of the gruesome pictures which in our youth we gazed at with awful interest, as representing the barbarous punishments in vogue in China, turn out to be representations of the supposed tortures inflicted on the damned in the Chinese hell! The extraordinary system of competitive examinations, which is thrown like a net over the whole population of the empire, is minutely described. But the most curious institution, perhaps, from our point of view, is the College of Chroniclers. All contemporary history is compiled by this State department with the greatest deliberation and absolute secrecy, the result of its labours never seeing the light until a new dynasty mounts the throne, perhaps centuries later. This is the only way known to Chinese for ensuring perfect truthfulness. What would our modern historians have found to do had the Tudor and Stuart periods been chronicled thus? Instead of journalists the Chinese have in each district a council of literary men, who have the exclusive privilege of reporting whatever they please, and "are never reprimanded for the groundlessness of their statements." The book is full of views new to us, both of China and of Europe, from the Chinese standpoint.

"The Cross and the Dragon"<sup>28</sup> is an elaborate account of missionary work and prospects in Southern China, with which are mixed in various jottings concerning China and the Chinese, not "painted by themselves."

We cannot praise "Three Months in the Soudan."<sup>29</sup> The author is

<sup>27</sup> "The Chinese Painted by Themselves." By Colonel Tcheng-ki-Tong, Military Attaché of China at Paris. London: Field & Tuer.

<sup>28</sup> "The Cross and the Dragon; or, Light in the Broad East." By Rev. B. C. Henry, ten years a missionary in Canton. London: S. W. Partridge & Co., 9, Paternoster Row, E.C.

<sup>29</sup> "Three Months in the Soudan." By Ernestine Sartorius. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1885.

a gallant soldier's wife, and therefore, we may assume, possesses the soldier's virtue—courage—and can look upon a hostile critic without flinching. We will, therefore, make no apology for telling her that we have found her book dull, trivial, flippant, devoid of graces of style, and deficient even in the elementary virtue of grammatical accuracy. The gossip of the camp and a very confusing second-hand account of the campaign are the chief contents of the book.

"Boots and Saddles"<sup>30</sup> resembles the last-noticed book in being the account given by a general's wife of a campaign against uncivilized tribes, in which her husband commanded, and on which she accompanied him. But Mrs. Custer wins our sympathy where Mrs. Sartorius fails. She is modest, sympathetic, observant. She suffered real hardships, and she relates them with frank simplicity. She almost makes us share her reverence for her gallant husband. Ten or twelve years make great changes in a region like Dakota; but as the book was written to answer the questions so often asked its author about "the domestic life of an army family," it has probably not suffered much loss of interest by the delay.

Mr. Lomas is a clear-headed, well-cultivated, observant traveller, who can appreciate what is excellent in "nature, art, and life."<sup>31</sup> But his work is cold, measured, sunless. We can read its pages with satisfaction so long as our predominating sentiment is a craving for knowledge; but we soon lay it down if we feel the need of warmth and colour. As a traveller's guide it will be welcomed by the cultivated for its good sense and accuracy, and its comprehensive views of Spaniards and all things Spanish. But after reading it we feel no desire to follow the author's footsteps. He is severe, but not unjust, towards the faults of Spaniards. Spain is a large country; yet Mr. Lomas has managed to take us, as his route-map will show, to almost every place of interest in the north, south, east, and centre. And he has "done" these places in a very business-like manner.

Count Paul Vasil<sup>32</sup> is a really wonderful man. He knows everybody intimately, and can tell us what everybody thinks on every conceivable subject—as least as far down in the social scale as "the lower middle class, composed of men with modest incomes (from two to four thousand a year)." Below that it seems you soon reach "lodging-houses, furnished apartments, and shop parlours," "classes" of society a foreign Count could hardly be expected to know much about, even when "the world of London" is his study, and a Count's "dear young friend" would not of course be interested in.

But in the higher ranks of Society, the Count is quite at home. As for the Queen—"personal acquaintance with her excites conflicting feelings," whatever may be the hidden significance of that oracular remark. Of course the Count has been a guest at Sandringham and

<sup>30</sup> "Boots and Saddles; or, Life in Dakota with General Custer." By Elizabeth B. Custer. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington. 1885.

<sup>31</sup> "Sketches in Spain, from Nature, Art, and Life." By John Lomas. Edinburgh: Adam & Charles Black. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1884.

<sup>32</sup> "The World of London" (La Société de Londres). By Count Paul Vasil. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington. 1885.

can give us an instance of the Prince of Wales's "perfect tact" in reminding those about him of what is due to him. "One evening while the Prince was playing billiards, an equerry quietly slipped off, and the Prince, leaving him time to undress and go to bed, suddenly affected to observe his absence, and sent for him." The Count knows all the little personal peculiarities of every member, male and female, of the aristocracy, and we are duly informed of the same. His remarks about politicians and journalists are fair and on the whole unobjectionable. We are glad to admit that if Count Vasili shows no insight into the genius of the English character, like M. Taine, neither is he vulgar and offensive, like Max O'Rell.

In this revolutionary age of ours, education has remained perhaps the most conservative of all the branches of life in England. New men come forward, new subjects are introduced, but oh! how modestly "modern sides" are established; but our schools remain much what they were thirty or forty years ago. The very towns in which they exist alter their appearance beyond recognition; yet our Etons, and even our more radical Rugbies, still maintain their old curriculum with merely slight modifications. Latin and Greek are still the bases of the education of the well-to-do classes; mathematics hold the second place. Only after these—"Proximus his, longo sed proximus intervallo"—the modern languages receive a little attention, and natural science still less. But if the subjects are little changed, the apparatus with which they are taught ever yields to new. A parent who visits his boy at a public school finds that he uses scarcely one of the books on which he himself was trained. The lad's shelves are laden with smartly-bound new hand-books, and new annotated selections; it is old-fashioned now-a-days for a boy to take a plain and complete text-book of Virgil or Horace into his class-room. A scarlet First Book of the *Æneid*, with notes by Mr. Brown, or a bright-blue Second Book of the *Iliad*, annotated by Mr. Jones, are the heaviest portions of his equipment; as for his mathematics—Euclid, how art thou transformed in some of the newer manuals! The requirements of book-sellers and the ambition of bookmakers and teachers have something to do with this change; but its advantages probably outbalance its evils, for Messrs. Brown and Jones are generally scholars, and put honest work into their little books.

In one branch of instruction there was, however, an unquestionable need for new books, for the simple reason that it had no suitable books a generation or two back. Many middle-aged men can remember that they had no opportunity of learning French or German at school; and those who were more fortunate had to sharpen their teeth on "Télémaque" or Schiller's "Dreissigjähriger Krieg," almost exclusively. This *lacuna* has, however, been largely filled up with good and bad books. It is but a few years since the Prince Consort practically introduced the study of German at Eton; and now there are actually before us two books of selections from Heine for school use. One of these<sup>33</sup> is edited by Dr. Buchheim, who, by his excellent

<sup>33</sup> "Heine's Prosa" (Vol. VII. of German Classics). Edited with Notes by C. A. Buchheim, Ph.D., F.C.P., &c. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

editions of the Classics, has done far more than any other man to forward the study of German in England and America. It would probably have staggered the Prince Consort somewhat, to learn that Heine would so soon be read by school-boys; we, however, fully approve Dr. Buchheim's choice. A boy's mind ought to be opened and exercised in all his work. For mere practice in German a newspaper paragraph, if not ungrammatical, would do as well as anything else. But in every boy who is learning German a man is growing; and to set that boy to work on Heine, is to foster the growth of thought and the formation of opinion—nay, it is to implant an intelligent knowledge of the history of the all-important century now ending. Dr. Buchheim's 220 pages of selections are all attractive, and are of course chosen with a view to their purpose. They are followed by a considerable body of excellent brief notes, and preceded by an interesting biographical sketch of his author. The book is beautifully printed, and, in view of the tendency of the age, Roman type has been adopted. It is enough to say that Dr. Buchheim has bestowed on this *opusculum* as much learning, labour and care as have marked his previous editions of German Classics.

Every school of mathematics has its own favourite way of presenting fundamental principles. Mr. Isaac Warren<sup>34</sup> may be accepted as a careful exponent of the order and methods adopted in the University of Dublin. In a text-book for schoolboys and undergraduates there is not scope for much originality, the chief objects to be kept in view being a proper logical arrangement of propositions, and clearness of demonstration. These merits are possessed by Mr. Warren's "Elements of Plane Trigonometry."

We have received the following, which we regret we cannot find space to notice more particularly:—

"Railway Management at Stations." By E. B. Ivatts, Goods Manager, Midland Great Western Railway (London: McCorquodale & Co., Euston Square, 1885). A really useful book, and more interesting to the general reader than we could have thought possible from its title.

"British Railways and Canals in relation to British Trade and Government Control." By Hercules. (London: Field & Tuer, The Leadenhall Press, E.C.)

"Representative American Orations, to illustrate American Political History." Edited with Introductions by Alexander Johnston, Professor of Jurisprudence and Political Economy in the College of New Jersey. (New York & London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1884.)

"Official Year Book of the Scientific and Learned Societies of Great Britain and Ireland: comprising Lists of the Papers read during 1884 before Societies engaged in Fourteen Departments of Research, with the names of their Authors." Second Annual Issue. (London: Chas. Griffin & Co., Exeter Street, Strand, 1885.)

"Proceedings of the Royal Colonial Institute. Edited by the

<sup>34</sup> "Elements of Plane Trigonometry for the Use of Schools and Students in Universities." By Rev. Isaac Warren, M.A., ex-Mathematical Scholar, Trinity College, Dublin. Dublin: Alexander Thom & Co. 1885.



**Secretary.** Vol. XVI., 1884-5. (London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington, 1885.)

"Report of the Minister of Education (Ontario) for the year 1884, with the Statistics of 1883." (Toronto: The "Grip" Printing & Publishing Co., 1885.)

"The Sabbath for Man: a Study of the Origin, Obligation, History, Advantages, and Present State of Sabbath Observance, &c." By Rev. Wilbur J. Crafts, A.M. (Funk & Wagnalls, New York & London, 1885.)

"Man's Birthright; or, the Higher Law of Property." By Edwd. H. G. Clark. (New York & London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1885.)

"Our Gipsies in City, Tent, and Van. Containing an Account of their Origin and Strange Life, &c." By Vernon S. Marwood. (London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington, 1885.)

"Dwelling Houses: Their Sanitary Construction and Arrangement." By W. H. Corfield, M.A., M.D. Oxon, F.R.C.P. London, &c. &c. Second Edition. (London: H. K. Lewis, 136, Gower Street, W.C., 1885.)

"Briton's Awake! !!" By A. B. C. (London: Kegan Paul, Trench and Co., 1885.)

"Patents and Patentees." Vols. xiii. and xiv., Indexes for the years 1878, 1879. By Richd. Gibbs, Registrar-General of Victoria. (Melbourne: John Ferres; and London: Trubner & Co, 1882 and 1884); "Victorian Year Book for 1883-84." By Henry Heylyn Hayter, C.M.G., Govt. Statist of Victoria. (Same publishers, 1884); "Second Report of the Civil Service Commission of the State of New York." (New York: Trow's Printing and Bookbinding Company, 1885); "The Place of Physical Science in Education. A Lecture by Geo. Cresswell." (Cape Town: J. C. Juta, 1884); "The Spanish Treaty opposed to Tariff Reform." (Questions of the Day—XVIII.) Report of a Committee of Inquiry appointed by the New York Free Trade Club. (New York: G. P. Putman's Sons, 1885); "The New Departure in College Education; being a Reply to President Eliot's Defence of it in New York." By James McCosh, D.D. (New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1885); "The Course of Study in Princeton College; being a Report to the Trustees of the College, by the President, 1884." "An Analysis of the Principles of Economics. Part I." By Patrick Giddes. (London: Williams & Norgate, 1885); "The Homes of the Poor in Westminster." By Rev. A. Jones, D.D. Second Edition. (London: Rivingtons, 1885); "Did Napoleon Ever Exist?" By J. B. Pérès. (London: Remington & Co. 1885.)

The elaborate statistics issued by the Direzione Generale della Statistica are as clearly arranged and as instructive as usual. One of these is an invaluable Bibliographical index: "Saggio di Bibliografia Statistica Italiana" (Roma Tipografia dei Fratelli Bencini, 1885). Besides this we have before us "Annali di Statistica," serie 3a, vols. xii. & xiii. (same publishers), and serie 3a vol. xiv. (Roma: Tipografia Viedi Botta, 1885); "Movimento dello Stato Civile; Confronti Internazionali per gli anni 1865-83." (Roma: Tipografia Elzeviriana,

1884); "*Movimento degli Infermi negli Ospidali Civili dell Regno, Anno 1883. Introduzione.*" (Roma: Tipografia della Camera dei Deputati, 1885), and "*Introduzione alla Statistica della Bancho Popolari Italiane (Anni 1881-83) con una Relazione de Luigi Luzzatti*" (Roma: Stabilimento Tipografico dell' Opinione, 1885.)

## SCIENCE.

MODERN SCIENCE gathers around a few great ideas, and has changed our conceptions in some ways of man's relation to the universe. Mr. Laing<sup>1</sup> has attempted to show the bearing of these changes on phases of thought which are commonly termed religious. His book divides into two parts: the first termed Modern Science, and the second termed Modern Thought. Modern science is treated of in six chapters, which discuss space, time, matter, life, the antiquity of man, and man's place in nature. There is nothing original in the facts presented, and the author's endeavour is rather to simplify and make accessible the teaching of Darwin, Lyell, Lubbock, Huxley, Proctor, and other writers. The chapter on space gives an idea of the method by which the vast extent of space is estimated, and summarizes facts enough to convey some idea of the action of gravity in the heavens. Just as the telescope brings under our eyes a world which seems practically infinite, so the microscope has revealed another world practically infinitesimal. In the second chapter Mr. Lang endeavours to show that geology has done for our conception of time almost as much as astronomy does for conceptions of space; and he states the evidence on which the duration of time is inferred from the succession of the strata and some of their organic deposits. The third chapter treats of ether, matter, and energy, of which the material universe is said to be composed, and concludes by comparing the universe to a clock, so perfectly constructed from the beginning as to require no outside interference during the time it has to run, to keep it going with absolute correctness. The next chapter, on Life, similarly deals with the elementary facts which govern existence, with the view of showing how the supernatural has faded from our conceptions in all physical characteristics of living things. The chapter concludes by inquiring, Are saints and heroes whom we revere, and the beautiful women whom we admire, descended, not from an all-glorious Adam and all-lovely Eve, but from palæolithic savages, more rude and bestial than the lowest tribe of Bushmen or Australians? Then the antiquity of man is told on the evidences of the flints found in gravels and in caves, and the forms of life which are associated with them, and other similar records, like those of the lake dwellings of Switzerland; but the author presses into his service the so-called

<sup>1</sup> "*Modern Science and Modern Thought.*" By S. Laing, Esq., M.P. London: Chapman and Hall, Limited. 1885.

miocene works of art described by Quatrefages, although accepting this antiquity with some doubt. Man's place in nature is a chapter designed to show that there is no difference of a physical kind of any importance between man and the lower animals, discusses the variations of the human race, and the development of language, religion, and civilization, with the conclusion that man is a product of laws of evolution. The second part consists of chapters on modern thought, miracles, Christianity without miracles, and practical life, quoting the well-known passages of "In Memoriam" which deal with the conflict of good and evil and the waste of life. The author urges that the discoveries of science have so far established the universality of law as to make it impossible for sincere men to retain the faith of their ancestors in dogmas and miracles. He fortifies himself with the authority of Carlyle, Rénan, and George Eliot; and urges that what the greatest thinkers think to-day, the mass of thinkers will think to-morrow, and the great army of non-thinkers will assume to be self-evident the day after. The phases of thought which have flowed from Darwin's teaching are stated especially in the philosophy of Agnosticism, which, it is remarked, does not negative the possibility of a future existence, but only objects to its being discussed as a matter of definite knowledge. The views of Comte and other phases of thought, like spiritualism and mesmerism, are well stated. Then succeeds a chapter on miracles, in which various miracles mentioned in Scripture as about to occur are shown not to have occurred, and the evidences concerning the Resurrection are examined, with the conclusion that the evidence for miracles is altogether insufficient to establish even an ordinary fact. The author concludes that Christianity is not only theoretical, but practical; and in reply to the question, Can Christianity continue to exist without miracles? states that practical Christianity needs no miracles.

The author would rest Christianity on the purity and loveliness of Christ's life and teaching, which he regards as the foundation of a religion which for nineteen centuries has been the main civilizing influence of the world, and the faith of its noblest races. The miracles are not rejected as fables but read as parables, though the author admits that this was not the intention of the original writers. The concluding chapter, on practical life, touches on matters which govern our well-being, such as self-reverence, self-knowledge, and self-control. From the first page to the last the book is charmingly written, with temperance and wisdom that will win a hearing for the author from many who may not share his views.

About the year 1870, or a little earlier, the late Professor Clifford delivered some courses of lectures to young ladies in London, upon the elementary conceptions and processes of mathematics. Being addressed to those whose experience of mathematical processes was likely to be limited to the mechanical teaching of so-called elementary rules, he took pains to simplify and subdivide the treatment, so that the mathematical ideas should be grasped without the drudgery incident to the old methods of teaching. How many of these courses

were delivered, or how far their substance has been preserved in pupils' note-books, we know not; but at length a volume<sup>2</sup> embraces so much of Clifford's work as had been prepared for press, although a considerable part of the book is due to other hands. The editor's work is not distinguished from the author's; and, so far as we can gather from the preface, the editor appears to have known but little of the author's intentions; for it is apparently only after the volume was finished that it was discovered that it should have included a chapter on mass. This subject, like the others, was freely discussed by Clifford with his friends, and though the chapter might not have been constructed from such data, the traces of its existence were worth following. As the book stands, it has very much the character of a restored group of statuary. We know that the chapter on number and the chapter on space are substantially reprinted from the shorthand writer's report. A part of the third chapter is attributed to Clifford. Chapter four, on position, is the editor's; and chapter five, on motion, is substantially Clifford's. It would be superfluous to say anything in praise of the conception of the work; it is the effort of an intellectual giant, to use his methods of thoughts in relaxation, as it were, so that young people might share in his enjoyment. It is only necessary to read the first chapter or two, to realize the wonderful teaching power which the volume displays; and we believe that no happier contribution was ever made to the science and methods of teaching. Clifford says: "We may depend upon it that algebra which cannot be translated into good English and sound common-sense is bad algebra." If teachers will take this saying to heart, and make use of methods, clear, exact, logical in their sequence, and complete in their series of stages, such as the author's work in this volume shows, mathematics would become a far more powerful aid in mental development, and might themselves be further developed by students so nurtured. The editor's task has been of no small difficulty, and has been very carefully performed.

Professor Tait's "Properties of Matter"<sup>3</sup> is the subject of the introduction to the course of Natural Philosophy in the University of Edinburgh. The author states that it presupposes a sound knowledge of ordinary geometry, a moderate acquaintance with the elements of algebra and trigonometry, and a general knowledge of the fundamental principles of kinematics of a point, and of kinetics of a particle. The book is designed as the first of a series which will comprise volumes on dynamics, sound, and electricity, in sequence to the volume on light already published. The work opens with an introductory chapter, enumerating the following axioms: first, the physical universe has an objective existence; 2, we become cognizant of it solely by the aid of our senses; 3, indications of the senses are always imperfect and

<sup>2</sup> The International Scientific Series. Vol. II. "The Common-sense of the Exact Sciences." By the late William Kingdon Clifford. With 100 figures. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1885.

<sup>3</sup> "Properties of Matter." By P. G. Tait, M.A., Sec. R.S.E. Edinburgh: Adam & Charles Black. 1885.

often misleading; and 4, that the patient exercise of reason enables us to control these indications. Using the word *thing* to denote any part of the physical universe, the author concludes that matter and energy are the only two classes of things; and that time and space, number, magnitude, position, velocity, &c., are not things, and that consciousness, volition, &c., are not physical. Matter is the means of manifesting energy, so that the properties of matter come to be distinct from the forms of energy, and comprise such ideas as gather round terms like mass, weight, cohesion, elasticity, &c. The various definitions of matter which writers have used are set forth, and the author selects the expression that matter is whatever can occupy space. The volume is divided into fourteen chapters and 332 numbered paragraphs, and includes certain illustrative appendices. Commencing with a statement of hypotheses concerning the ultimate structure of matter, the views current as to the nature of atoms are set forth. Then the terms in common use, by which the properties of matter are made intelligible, are discussed in a broad philosophical way. We then approach the great conceptions of time and space; and this leads to a discussion of many other terms by which the properties of time and space are more accurately expressed. In succeeding chapters, impenetrability, porosity, and divisibility are discussed, before Professor Tait proceeds to consider Newton's laws of motion and gravitation. Those subjects lead naturally to considerations connected with deformation and elasticity; the compressibility of gases, liquids, and solids; while cohesion and capillarity, diffusion, osmose, transpiration, and viscosity are cognate. The last chapter is on the aggregation of particles. The work is clearly written, and gives an intelligible account of the fundamental principles of physics, so as to be, but for a few paragraphs, within the grasp of readers who have no mathematical knowledge. It is well calculated to stimulate a student's reflective powers, and is a very able introduction to the study of physics.

We have received "*An Elementary Star Atlas*,"\* by the Rev. Mr. Espin. It includes maps for the months, with a page of description to each. The boundaries of the constellations are the same as those in general use in this country, but the magnitudes of the stars are indicated as in the *Atlas of Hies*. The result seems to us obscure, and it is not easy to identify the constellations from the maps, owing to the crowding of symbols of different forms and sizes. The notes, however, are excellent.

An interesting course of "*Six Lectures on School Hygiene*"<sup>†</sup> was delivered before the Massachusetts Teachers' Association by as many American physicians. The opening lecture, on "*School Hygiene*," discusses the general questions which should be considered in estab-

\* "*An Elementary Star Atlas.*" A Series of Twelve Simple Star Maps, with descriptive letterpress. By Rev. T. H. E. C. Espin, B.A., F.R.A.S. With a preface by Westwood Oliver. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1885.

† "*Six Lectures upon School Hygiene.*" Delivered, under the auspices of the Massachusetts Emergency and Hygienic Association, to Teachers in Public Schools. Boston: Ginn & Co. 1885.

lishing a school. First as to situation, as far removed as possible from noisy and unwholesome trades and industries, and so built that as much sunlight as possible may enter the rooms. Ventilation and heating are discussed, but even allowing for the statement that Americans require a higher temperature than Europeans, 65° F. to 70° F. seems to us altogether too high a temperature for healthy school work. Overcrowding and drainage receive consideration, as does care of the eyes. Overwork would appear to be becoming serious in Massachusetts, for while in 1860 there were 1,386 deaths in the State from disorders of the brain, the number had risen to 3,562 in 1883, out of all proportion to the increase of population, and manifested chiefly in apoplexy, paralysis, and insanity. This is essentially an introductory lecture by Dr. Frank Wells, and is amplified in the five lectures which follow: Professor Draper treating of "Heating and Ventilation;" Dr. Williams on "Care of the Eyes during School Years;" Dr. Shattock on "Epidemics and Disinfection;" Dr. Frank Wells on "Drainage;" and Dr. Folsom on "The Relation of Public Schools to Disorders of the Nervous System." There are many excellent practical suggestions scattered through the volume, which should be considered by all who take part in education, though for many reasons the conditions of American schools are not always comparable to those of this country.

Mr. Romanes some years ago came before the scientific public as an original experimenter upon jelly-fish. He has now somewhat popularized and systematized his work, and added to the studies of jelly-fish a study of star-fish and sea-urchins.<sup>6</sup> The object of his labours is to exhibit the nature of the nerves in these organisms. The book is divided into ten chapters, and opens with an account of the structure of the Medusæ, with a view of pointing out what was known of their nervous structure when the author's observations commenced. The next chapter, entitled Fundamental Experiments, describes the effects of cutting away various portions of the organism, with the conclusion that removal of the extreme margin of the animal, completely and instantly paralyses locomotion, and that the covered-eyed Medusæ have the locomotor centres more diffused than in the naked-eyed Medusæ. Experiments are then made in stimulation by the action of light, electricity, temperature, and other agents, followed by experiments in dividing the body in a number of remarkable ways, so as to show the paths in which sensation travels through the tissues, first in the covered-eyed types, and then in the naked-eyed Medusæ. The sixth chapter describes experiments in co-ordination. Attention is next given to the natural rhythm of movements of the bell in Medusæ, with experiments on the way in which it is influenced by segmentation, mutilation, temperature, and various gases. Observations follow on the artificial rhythm obtained after paralyzing the swimming-bell. The ninth chapter is devoted to experiments show-

<sup>6</sup> The International Scientific Series. Vol. L. Jelly-fish, Star-fish, and Sea urchins. Being a research on Primitive Nervous Systems." By G. J. Romanes, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1885.

ing the effects of various poisons upon jelly-fish, from which it appears that there is an extraordinary resemblance to their action on higher animals. The last chapter describes the structure of star-fishes and sea-urchins, especially in the matter of the tube-feet, or ambulacral system; and then deals with the use of the feet, with various experiments in stimulation. Experiments in dividing the body are also detailed, with examination of the special senses. It will thus be seen that this is a special physiological research rather than a popular memoir, and it appeals more to naturalists engaged in research than to those who appreciate results at which science has arrived. A book of more general zoological interest might have been produced if the treatment had been of a general kind, and less space given to matters which the author has already published in Transactions of scientific societies. There is no index.

Dr. Francis Warner's book on physical expression<sup>7</sup> is devoted chiefly to an explanation of its phenomena. The work consists of nineteen chapters, illustrated by some fifty diagrams. After the introductory chapter the author discusses expression and the inferences which expression may convey in men and animals—the term expression being used in a wide sense to indicate function or property. There is some want of clearness consequent upon this inexact use of familiar words. Succeeding chapters discuss movements, and the physiology of expression, by which the author understands dependence of physiological action upon nerve stimulation. Postures receive a good deal of consideration as means of expression, a chapter being given to the upper extremity, one to the head, a chapter to the face, and another to the eyes. The succeeding chapters deal with general conditions of the brain, the action of the brain in the infant and adult, art criticism, a chapter of passages in literature which bear on the general principles which the author advances; while a final chapter describes method and apparatus for obtaining records of movements in the limbs. This work seems to us misleading in its title and not well digested in its matter, and although it contains much that is interesting, the reader is introduced to angularities of treatment which seem to us unnecessary.

The "Birds of Lancashire"<sup>8</sup> forms a handy little volume, full of careful observation and interest. There are two hundred and fifty-six species of birds in Lancashire, of which eighty-five are residents, thirty-one summer visitors, sixty-five winter visitors, and seventy-five occasional visitors. The residents all breed within the county, except the lesser black-backed gull and the herring gull. The peregrine falcon, common buzzard, henharrier, nut-hatch, goldfinch, rock-dove, water-rail, and spotted crane, all still breed, but are becoming rare; while the pied flycatcher is a summer visitor now very rare. The crossbill formerly bred regularly. The

<sup>7</sup> The International Scientific Series. Vol. LII. "Physical Expression: its Modes and Principles." By Francis Warner, M.D. Lond., F.R.C.P. With fifty-one illustrations. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1885.

<sup>8</sup> "The Birds of Lancashire." By F. S. Mitchell. Illustrated by J. G. Keulemans, Victor Prout, &c. London: John Van Voorst. 1885.

occasional visitors include the roseate tern, which was formerly a regular summer migrant. Several species appear to have escaped from confinement, such as the Egyptian goose, Canada goose, &c. The introduction details many interesting particulars concerning Lancashire birds, the publications which relate to them, and the observers who have contributed information from their several localities. The result of this co-operation has been an excellent handbook, which is further enriched by a map of Lancashire, two or three coloured figures of the black-throated wheatear and the wall-creeper, and some other illustrations. It were much to be desired that every county had its local natural histories written on a similar plan.

"The Ministry of Flowers"<sup>9</sup> is almost of the nature of a series of flower sermons. The little volume is divided into four parts or books: the first treats of human life, the second of the evils of life, the third of the virtues of life, and the fourth of other features of life. Each of these chapters is subdivided into many short addresses, in which Biblical quotations are frequent, and discourses concerning flowers form a large part of the matter. The book is illustrated with a number of figures of common plants. It is a popular scientific book, written for those who like a little science mixed with a little Scripture.

Dr. J. C. Brown has added another volume to his series on Forestry in Russia.<sup>10</sup> The present compilation is divided into five parts. The first part treats of the forests of Poland. The same method is adopted of describing the different processes of forest exploitation, the area, distribution, management, and produce of forests, with an enumeration of the Polish school of forestry. A chapter is added on Polish history, which does not appear to have any connection with forestry. The second part is devoted to Lithuania. Some account is given of the country and its people, and the area and distribution of the forests. The forests of the Dnieper valley are treated in some detail. A few pages describe the forests of the Ukraine. The fourth part gives particulars of the timber exports from the Baltic; and the fifth part describes the administration of forests in the Baltic provinces of Russia. It is needless to say that there is a large amount of interesting information brought together, which would probably be more useful to students if it were more systematically digested.

The failure of ordinary farming industries in this country, now for many years, has led to increased attention to the dairy. In 1879 we imported two million hundredweights of butter, of the value of £10,250,000. In 1883 the import of butter had risen to 2,332,701 cwts. Of cheese we imported in 1879 two million hundredweights, of the value of nearly £4,000,000, and in this item also the imports show an increase. In the matter of cheese a large part of the total consists of

<sup>9</sup> "The Ministry of Flowers." Being some thoughts respecting Life suggested by the book of Nature. By the Rev. Hilderic Friend, F.L.S. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1885.

<sup>10</sup> "Forests and Forestry in Poland, Lithuania, Ukraine, and the Baltic Provinces of Russia." With notices of the export of timber from Memel, Dantzic, and Riga. Compiled by John Croumbie Brown, LL.D. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co. Montreal: Dawson Brothers. 1885.



kinds which are in general demand, but which English farmers are too conservative to produce. In this neglect of the dairy the British people are altogether exceptional, and many continental nations have long since manufactured for their own consumption every cheese for which there is a demand. Influenced by such considerations, Mr James Long has written a most interesting practical account of dairy farming.<sup>11</sup> Having briefly considered our dairy system and the distribution of milch cows in the country, chapters are devoted to the different kinds of dairy produce—milk, butter, and cheese, with interesting particulars concerning the quality of milk, the manufacture of condensed milk, milk analysis and adulteration, transport of milk by railways, and the manufacture and value of cream. Then succeed chapters on butter and its constituents; cheese, curd and whey: and koumiss. The various processes of butter-making and cheese-making are described. To these preliminaries succeed descriptions of the different ways in which dairies are constructed, with figures and descriptions of the utensils and appliances; such as churns, cream-separators, milk-coolers, butter-presses, and many other kinds of dairy apparatus. The different instruments used in making cheese—the curd-mills, presses, cheese-vats—are similarly discussed. An interesting chapter describes the milk factories of many parts of Europe; another chapter is devoted to the dairy farm. But not the least interesting and valuable portion of the book consists of an account of the cheese-making industries of the various parts of France, Italy, Switzerland, Belgium, Holland, and Denmark. As a popular statement of information that is not generally accessible, and which, in part at least, is the result of personal observation, this volume is likely to be useful in directing attention to some of the conditions under which dairy farming may be further developed in this country.

"Paradise Found"<sup>12</sup> is in some respects a delightful and learned book. At the opening of his preface the author states it is not the work of a dreamer, neither has it proceeded from a love of learned paradox; nor is it a cunningly devised fable aimed at particular tendencies of current science, philosophy, or religion. It is a thoroughly serious and sincere attempt to present what is to the author's mind the true and final solution of one of the greatest and most fascinating of all problems connected with the history of mankind. The work is divided into six parts, and includes a number of appendices. Part I. on the "Location of Eden," consists of three chapters, which give the results of explorers who have searched the earth to discover it; the researches of theologians, who have endeavoured to locate it on Biblical data; and the results of naturalists and scholars, whose points of view have not been theological. The second part states the hypothesis that

<sup>11</sup> "British Dairy Farming." To which is added a description of the chief Continental systems. By James Long ("Merlin" of "The Field." London: Chapman & Hall. 1885.

<sup>12</sup> "Paradise Found: the Cradle of the Human Race at the North Pole." A study of the prehistoric world. By William F. Warren, S.T.D., LL.D., President of Boston University. With original illustrations. London: Saumpson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington. 1885.

the primitive Eden was at the North Pole, and enumerates the characteristics which such an Eden would have possessed before the Poles had their present temperature. The third part proceeds to discuss the hypothesis from many scientific aspects. First, it is urged that the Poles of the earth would have cooled before the equatorial regions, and that life would consequently have commenced sooner at the Poles than elsewhere. Secondly, astronomical geography is appealed to to show that the length of the polar night is not so great as to have interfered seriously with the development of life, and that the period of darkness probably varies between two months and a little over ten weeks, so that the duration of light is affirmed to be greater at the Pole than at the Equator. Then the testimony of physiographical geology is invoked to show that ancient lands occupied the polar region, and have disappeared by depression. The views of many naturalists are set forth to show that the polar regions in those days must have possessed an Eden-like climate. The Tertiary flora, described by Professor Heer, is considered to substantiate the author's view, that the modern types of life have spread from the North Pole, and there are some anthropological considerations which tend to the same conclusion. Similar views were put forward by Mr. C. Hilton Scribner in a recent work, "Where did Life begin?" noticed in *THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW*. The fourth part is an examination of ethnic traditions in ancient cosmology and mythical geography, and in the ideas of Japanese, Chinese, Eastern Aryan, old Persian, Akkadian, Assyrian, Babylonian, ancient Egyptian and ancient Greek literature, with a view of showing that the teachings of all peoples tend to support the author's hypothesis of a Garden of Eden at the North Pole. The fifth part discusses verifications based upon the peculiarities of a polar paradise to be found in the stars of Eden, the day, the Eden zenith, the navel of the earth, the quadrifurcate river, the central tree, and the exuberance of life. And the author concludes this part by stating that our Arctic Eden, by explaining the origin of the cosmological conceptions of ancient Chaldea, Egypt, and India, explains at the same time the origin of the most eccentric and apparently senseless conceptions of mediæval and modern cosmographies. The concluding or sixth part is designed to show the significance of the author's results in relation to biological studies, the study of ancient literature, the origin of religion, and the theory of civilization. If it were not that the book has a serious side, it might be regarded as a most delightful work of fiction in the garb of science. But the author, who states such facts as come in his way excellently, is weaving the whole fabric of modern knowledge into a story which shall satisfy certain conditions of an ancient tradition as to the first home of man; and, unable to accept, or apparently comprehend, the conditions of human evolution, all nature is twisted into a polar knot, to support the flagging faith that primeval man was perfect. The author pleads that we will admit reversed evolution, out of which the human race has grovelled into its present degraded condition. Neither a belief in deluges, or original creation of man, or a divine Eden at the North Pole,

is now necessary to the well-being of the human race. But if we exclude from the book the author's serious pretensions, and treat it as a work in which imagination and no small amount of learning are disporting themselves in the playground of science, the book will be found not undeserving of examination.

## HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

DR. WILHELM GEIGER'S extensive and careful researches into the religion and life of the primitive Zoroastrians have excited much interest throughout Europe, and his great work, *Ostiranische Kultur im Alterthum*, is well known to all who are occupied in kindred studies. Those who cannot read German easily—and unfortunately there are many such still—will now be able to read a good English translation of the greater portion of the work,<sup>1</sup> and a translation which is doubly valuable from the fact of the writer being a Parsee, and therefore naturally understanding and sympathizing with the subject, and being able, occasionally, to correct errors of the author. For instance, Dr. Geiger, in his chapter on Marriage, after speaking of the equal position of the Iranian wife, who was *numano pathni*, mistress of the house, with her husband, who was *numano paiti*, master of the house, goes on to say “that the marriage of relations is not only unforbidden in the Avesta, but even recommended and described as a meritorious and pious action. It is esteemed as an institution that has proceeded from Mazda and Zarathushtra, and is thus sanctioned as a very ancient custom and a divine ordinance.” On this Mr. Sanjana quotes the passage which Dr. Geiger cites to support his view, and differs with him in its interpretation. The word translated marriage “does not properly refer to marriage among mankind, as Dr. Spiegel and others have endeavoured to interpret it, but it rather signifies that the religion revealed to Zarathushtra by Ahura Mazda is the only medium on earth the sincere belief in which infallibly conduces so to exalt the human mind as to bring it to a clear conception of the Deity. Whatever might be the view of the later Pahlavi writers with regard to the word *Khveludas*, we have no single instance in the Avesta which can suggest the idea that amongst the Avesta nation there ever was a marriage contracted between brother and sister.” And farther on in the same chapter: “Sons and wives are esteemed as an ornament to a house, and the *yazatas* bestow them upon the pious in abundance. This might be construed as an indication that polygamy was customary, and a great number of women a mark of opulence and divine blessing.” The translator's note is as follows:—

The passage wherein the Avesta esteems “sons and wives as an ornament to a family” does not imply the wives of a single man, but all the married

<sup>1</sup> “Civilization of the Eastern Iranians in Ancient Times.” By Dr. Wilhelm Geiger. Translated by D. D. Peshotan Sanjana, R.A. London: Henry Frowde. 1885.

women living in the same house. Just as is the case now in Parsee families, so also in the age of the Avesta, may we conceive a Zoroastrian family as having married daughters, daughters-in-law, and even grand-daughters-in-law, with the *mater familias* at their head, all forming a group of more than a dozen women. Even when the Zoroastrian prays for sons, he does not generally pray for sons only, but for sons and wives—*i.e.*, sons who should be sufficiently well settled in life to afford to marry as well as to maintain households of their own.

In the description of the Iranian method of disposing of corpses, Dr. Geiger speaks of the places of exposure as *dakhmas*, which must be erected on waste lands. As the community grew, "many *dakhmas* had to be pulled down and erected farther off, when civilization had approached them. This explains why the closing of *dakhmas* is esteemed meritorious." Again Mr. Sanjana corrects the German scholar's interpretation of the meaning of a word.

How Dr. Geiger could conceive this totally new aspect of the meritoriousness of pulling down the *dakhmas*, we cannot imagine. The word, as it is used throughout the Avesta, does not mean the place for the exposure of the Iranian dead, but the covered tomb of any person, be he Zoroastrian or non-Zoroastrian. As the Vendidad strictly orders the exposure of the dead body to the light of the sun, its consumption by vultures, and the preservation of the bones in an *astodan*, so also does it forbid closed sepulchres to the adherents of the Law while it compels them to pull down and destroy any tomb whereby to restore as science has taught us but lately, the natural purity of mother earth, upon whom solely depends the subsistence of the animal creation.

These instances will suffice to show how valuable this translation will be even to those who possess the work in its original German.

Many people go to Rome to study the remains of the early greatness of the mistress of the world, but few, except professed antiquaries, take the trouble to explore the grandest monument of the power and determination of the Romans which is to be found in their own country. When a villa is discovered in the Isle of Wight, when Roman cinerary urns and glass bottles are found in Newgate Street, there is some excitement in amateur archaeological circles; but who ever goes to see the Roman Wall? How few people ever think that even the name of the coals they burn in their drawing-room fires is a relic of Roman dominion! And yet a walk along the Wall from Tynemouth to Bowness must be one of the most fascinating tramps to be had in England. A wild country with beautiful scenery, and the constant excitement of discovering the half-forgotten relics of a long past chapter in our history—long past indeed, but of which the effects will never pass away till the New Zealander moralizes over the ruins of St. Paul's—what more can any one except the devotee of sport want for a brief holiday? If any one means to try this tour the new edition of Mr. Bruce's Handbook<sup>2</sup> will be indispensable. It has a capital map, on the scale of half an inch to a mile, mounted on linen, so that it can be consulted in the open air without fear of a gust of wind tearing it, and directions about hotel accommodation, which is not very plentiful on the Borders.

<sup>2</sup> "The Handbook to the Roman Wall." By J. Collingwood Bruce, LL.D., D.C.L., F.S.A. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1885.

No one knew so much about it as Mr. Bruce, and his opinion is not that of the ordinary English history book—that the Wall was the boundary of the Roman empire on the North, and a defence against Northern enemies—but that it was built to act as the base of military operations both on the North and South, as every station and mile-castle has as wide a gate and easy access on one side as on the other. Mr. Bruce also thinks that the stone wall and earthen vallum were both reared by order of Hadrian, and repaired by Severus, not that one emperor erected the vallum and another the wall. Visitors must not expect to find the remains of luxury and magnificence as in the South of England. The stations were strongly built, but no beautiful tessellated pavement, as at Brading, or painted wall plaster, is to be found, and the altars and inscriptions are rarely the work of trained artists. But the mechanical and engineering part of the work is superb. The stone wall, eighteen feet high, and from seven to nine feet wide, with a ditch and earthen rampart to correspond, is carried over the most rugged ground, and it is difficult in some places to realize how the blocks of stone were lifted into their places. It has been calculated that the work must have occupied 10,000 men for two years, and would cost a million pounds if executed at the present time. Of course there are but few places where the remains of the work are at all perfect, but the charming little etchings of stations and portions of the Wall show how much of interest there is still to be seen.

An enthusiast for Tudor architecture is rare nowadays. It is nearly fifty years since Hunt's "Exemplars" was published, and Early English or Decorated for ecclesiastic and scholastic buildings, and "Queen Anne" for domestic purposes, have mostly been the fashion; and, like most other artists, architects are apt to decry all styles and periods except the one they have selected for special study. Mr. Law,<sup>3</sup> not being an architect, can afford to have a taste of his own, and admire "the elasticity of Tudor Gothic and its adaptability to domestic purposes," and the variety and freedom of the grouping of the windows, which are distributed and proportioned, not according to the rule and line of a dull uniformity which destroys the comfort of so many modern houses, but as internal convenience required, and thus become a principal element in picturesqueness. The show part of the Palace is well known to every one. There can be no pleasanter place to spend a quiet afternoon on days when holiday-makers are elsewhere; but it is the pictures and the gardens which folk generally notice more than the buildings. The Great Hall (not Wolsey's really, but Henry VIII.'s, though Willement put up the Cardinal's arms in the windows) is familiar enough, but the living-rooms of Wolsey's Palace are used as private apartments, and not shown. One of these, looking towards the Fountain Court, has a most beautiful ceiling "of pure *cinque-cento* design in octagonal panels with decorative scroll-work and other ornaments in relief. The ribs are of moulded wood, with balls and leaden leaves at their intersections. These and the ornamental work

<sup>3</sup> "The History of Hampton Court Palace in Tudor Times." By Ernest Law, B.A., Barrister-at-Law. London: George Bell & Sons. 1885.

within the panels are gilt, the ground being of light blue." The walls are hung with tapestries, and above is a finely wrought frieze with cardinal's hats and "nakyd childer." The fireplace is a low recess with a depressed arch with straight sides, and in the thickness of the wall is a curious little closet. Another is the room to which belongs the oriel window in the Clock Court. This and the next rooms have ribbed ceilings of complex design, with the Cardinal's devices; while another, which must have been very sombre even when new, is panelled to the ceiling with oak, the panels bearing the linen pattern. The plates of these rooms show the deep-set windows; the seats, or ledges, for sometimes they are too high for seats, were covered with carpets. "Bankers" is the name they bore when used for this purpose. Carpets were hardly ever used for the floor in Tudor times, as Mr. Law supposes. Tablecloths, cupboard-cloths, and window-seats—these were the principal uses to which they were put. The old French phrase, *sur le tapis*, is an indication that the tables, and not floors, were the habitual places in which to see carpets. Two other things that the public never see at Hampton Court are the Ghosts and the Spider. Of ghosts there are three. Queen Jane Seymour used to wander silently about the doorway to Katharine of Aragon's rooms on the second floor on the eastern side of the Clock Court, but has not been seen recently. But one of her successors is not so quiet. When Catharine Howard was confined to her own room before being sent to the Tower, she escaped and ran to the chapel, where the King was hearing Mass. The guard carried her off screaming, and

in this gallery, it is said, a female form, dressed in white, has been seen coming towards the door of the royal pew, and, just as she reaches it, has been observed to hurry back with disordered garments and a ghastly look of despair, uttering at the same time the most unearthly shrieks, till she passes through the door at the end of the gallery. The gallery is now the lumber-room for old pictures, and, as the staircase is locked up at night, the voice of the shrieking Queen is said to be but rarely heard.

Mrs. Cavendish Boyle and Lady Eastlake have, however, both heard it, and furnished Mr. Law with written statements, which it is a pity he had not permission to print. The third, also well authenticated, is the ghost of Edward VI.'s nurse, Mrs. Penn, perhaps the "mother Jak" of Holbein. She was buried at Hampton in a tomb with a life-sized recumbent effigy, which was removed for the building of a new organ-loft in 1829, and her remains scattered. Soon after, noises like a woman spinning, and crooning to herself, were heard in the south-west wing, and on investigation by the Board of Works, who were called in to exorcise the spirit, a hidden chamber was discovered with a spinning-wheel and a few other articles. Since then a sentry has been frightened by her apparition, and also a recent arrival at the Palace who was unaware of the legend. The ghost is recognized by its likeness to the effigy. The spider, a reddish-brown beast with long legs, sometimes five inches across, is said to be "in some mysterious way connected with Wolsey's disaster, and destined for ever to haunt

the scene of his former greatness;" but the romance has been destroyed by finding it elsewhere, and giving it a Latin name. We must not quit the subject without a word of praise for the illustrations, which are excellent, well chosen, and well executed.

The object of Sir James Stephen's new book<sup>4</sup> may, with much propriety, be described in the author's own words as follows:—

Impey, in the present day, is known to English people in general only by the terrible attack made upon him by Lord Macaulay in his essay on Warren Hastings. . . . "Impey, sitting as a judge, put a man unjustly to death in order to serve a political purpose." . . . These dreadful accusations I, upon the fullest consideration of all the facts . . . and in particular of much evidence which Macaulay seems to me never to have seen, believe to be wholly unjust. For Macaulay himself I have an affectionate admiration. . . . I was, moreover, his successor in office, and am better able than most persons to appreciate the splendour of the services which he rendered to India. These considerations make me anxious, if I can, to repair a wrong done by him, not intentionally . . . but because he adopted, on insufficient grounds, the traditional hatred which the Whigs bore to Impey, and also because . . . he was, probably, not aware that a few sentences which came from him with little effort were enough to brand a man's name with almost indelible infamy.

At the time the story opens there was still a Nabob of Bengal, who stood to the great rulers in the same relation that the present Bey of Tunis stands to the French. The government, with the exception of military, foreign, and diplomatic affairs, was delegated to a great native Minister, Mohammed Reza Khan, a Persian Mussulman. His competitor for the office, who was passed over by Lord Clive, in whom the appointment rested, was a Brahmin, the Maharajah Nuncomar. In 1772, when Hastings was appointed Governor of Bengal, Reza had been in power about seven years, and the infant Nabob had been confided to his guardianship. The Directors, becoming disappointed with the revenue returns, attributed the deficiency to the mismanagement of Reza, in which error they were confirmed by the agents of Nuncomar. The Governor was accordingly directed to arrest Reza, remove him from the government, and institute a strict inquiry, in the prosecution of which he was to avail himself of the assistance of Nuncomar. These orders were duly obeyed, and after a long investigation Hastings pronounced that the charge was not made out, and set the accused at liberty—the young Nabob being committed to the guardianship of Munny Begum, a lady of his late father's harem; Nuncomar rewarded by the appointment of his son, Goordass, as treasurer of the household; and the government of the province transferred to European hands. In 1773 the Regulating Act was passed, by which it was provided that Hastings should be appointed Governor-General, assisted by a Council of four—viz., Barwell, Francis, Clavering, and Monson; and that a Supreme Court, consisting of a chief and three puisne judges, should be established at Calcutta, with powers independent of the Governor and Council. Hastings, possessing but a single vote in the Council, and being sup-

---

<sup>4</sup> "The Story of Nuncomar and the Impeachment of Sir Elijah Impey." By Sir James Fitzjames Stephen, K.C.S.I. London: Macmillan & Co. 1885. 2 vols.

ported by Barwell only, was unable to prevent the majority from wresting the government out of his hands. Nuncomar, in March, 1775, gave Francis a paper charging Hastings with taking bribes from Reza, Goordass, and Munny Begum. This document the Governor-General declined to allow to be submitted to the Council; being supported by Barwell only, he declared the sitting closed, and left the room with Barwell. The majority then declared itself a Council, received the accusation, examined Nuncomar, declared that the charges were made out, and that Hastings should be called upon to refund. At this juncture Nuncomar was openly inviting similar charges against the Governor-General, when he was arrested on a charge of forging a bond six years before. It may not uncharitably be presumed that, although the prosecutor was a native, Hastings was the real instigator of the proceeding. However, be that as it may, Nuncomar was tried by the judges of the Supreme Court and a jury, and by the unanimous voice both of judges and jury found guilty, and executed accordingly. Lord Macaulay endeavours to show that in this and other transactions Impey was but the tool of a greater villain—Hastings—and to the exoneration of Sir Elijah Impey from the charge of judicial murder Sir James Stephen devotes the major part of the two volumes now before us. His exposition of the law and the facts are such as might be expected from a lawyer of his eminence, and the result is to show beyond all reasonable doubt that Lord Macaulay's imputations are unfounded. Space forbids us to enter into the other charges against Impey, which have been dealt with by Sir James with similar skill and success. We can only regret that the nature of the subject does not commend itself to the general public, but only to the students of law and Indian history, and that for the same reason the author has in his answer been unable to emulate the eloquence of the accuser. We trust that after no long delay we may enjoy the privilege of perusing the full history of the impeachment of Warren Hastings, foreshadowed in the Preface of the present work.

Professor Holland's book on the Eastern Question<sup>a</sup> cannot be said to have appeared a whit too soon, for it gives us, what has long been wanted, a clear and concise account of the rise and development of various provinces now more or less independent, but which formerly formed part and parcel of the Ottoman Empire, and only within little more than half a century have become emancipated from Turkish supremacy by the concerted action of the European Powers. This assumption of a collective authority to supervise the solution of the Eastern Question, or, in other words, "to regulate the disintegration of Turkey," has been of gradual growth. It has been exercised by the European Powers tentatively since 1826, confining itself at first to outlying portions of the Ottoman Empire, and only systematically since 1856, when the Powers assumed to deal with the central mass, from which they detached various tracts of territory and erected them into independent States. Its influence has been felt in

---

<sup>a</sup> "The European Concert in the Eastern Question." By Thomas Erskine Holland, D.C.L. Oxford: Clarendon Press.



Greece, Egypt, the Danubian Principalities, the Balkan peninsula, and other European provinces of Turkey, and has played no inconsiderable part in the delimitation of boundaries of Turkey and Russia in Asia. The texts of the most important treaties and other public acts giving effect to this collective authority from time to time have been set out at length, collected from Parliamentary Papers and other sources not always accessible to the student. These have been carefully annotated, and such portions of them as are no longer in force have been, so far as was convenient, printed in italics; this, however, does not strictly apply to several of the financial decrees relating to Egypt, which, although "superseded to an extent greater than could well be expressed by italicizing portions of them," have nevertheless been set out *in extenso* in order to make the later decrees more intelligible. We cannot but commend this practice of giving the reader the original texts of what may justly be regarded as "the title-deeds or Constitutional Charters" of those States or partially emancipated provinces which owe their freedom and independence to the concerted action of the European Powers. If it were only for the benefit to be derived from having these public acts thus collected and systematized from the scattered pages of Parliamentary Blue-Books, we consider the publication of this book to be a matter for congratulation to Professor Holland and the Delegates of the Clarendon Press, as likely to prove a useful work for reference; but in addition to this we have a short historical introduction to each series of texts, explaining the successive steps which led to each treaty or act. No trace of political bias is to be found in these, which confine themselves to a plain chronological statement of facts as they occurred; and it is to this portion of the book, whether dealing with the struggle for independence by Greece, or with the financial difficulties of Egypt, or with the attempts made by Russia to interfere with the destinies of Eastern Europe in the Balkan peninsula to the exclusion of all other European Powers, we think the majority of readers will turn with most interest. The work has been written up to date, the latest text being that of the Declaration at London of the Great Powers and the Porte, dated March 17 of the present year, relative to Egypt, with annexed convention and decree. A digest of the Treaty of Berlin signed by the Powers July 13, 1878, and its practical effect taken in conjunction with the former Treaties of Paris and London, are clearly put before the reader, and form necessarily a large portion of the book. The leading idea of the earlier treaties is shown to have been the preservation of the independence and territorial integrity of the Ottoman Empire, whilst the Treaty of Berlin took a new departure. Thenceforth the Porte was to be placed, as it were, under the tutelage of Europe, and, although we do not altogether agree with Professor Holland when he says that "its suzerainty over the principalities was to be finally extinguished," seeing that the Sultan is at the present moment being recognized as suzerain over Egypt, it cannot be denied that the Ottoman jurisdiction was more straitly narrowed and defined by this treaty than by any other. Whether the Congress of Berlin has effected a radical cure for the "sick man,"

or how long it will be before the European Powers may have occasion once more to tender "advice" to him, time alone can show.

It is the rare distinction of the Colonial Office to have numbered at the same time among its permanent officials two such distinguished literary men as Sir James Stephen and Sir Henry Taylor, of both of whom it is true that their literary labours in no wise diminished the value or the efficiency of their official work. The "*Autobiography of Sir Henry Taylor*"<sup>6</sup> is, on the whole, a heavy book. The most interesting passages are those in which the writer sketches the different Colonial Secretaries under whom he served. Of these, he thinks the late Earl of Derby was the worst, the late Earl Russell the best. Those who remember Lord Derby will recognize the truth of this description:—"His skill as a debater enabled him to do without knowledge of his own. He took his topics from his opponents. Of anything of which he knew nothing, let but one view be presented to him, and he had not the slightest difficulty in presenting another and opposite one; and in this way, so far as information was concerned, he lived upon the enemies' country." Lord Glenelg he describes as "high-minded, accomplished, and occasionally eloquent, but habitually and incurably sluggish and somnolent." In early life Sir Henry was thrown among a set of young Benthamites, all of whom afterwards attained distinction. He speaks of "Charles Austin's bold and buoyant vivacities, the gentle and thoughtful precision of John Romilly, the searching insight of John Mill, the steady and sterling sense of Edward Strutt [the late Lord Belper], the gibes and mockeries of Charles Villiers, and the almost feminine grace combined with the masculine intellect of Hyde Villiers." His sketch of John Stuart Mill is life-like:—"His manners were plain, neither graceful nor awkward, his features refined and regular, the eyes small relatively to the scale of the face, the jaw large, the nose straight and finely shaped, the lips thin and compressed, the forehead and head capacious, and both face and body seemed to represent outwardly the inflexibility of the inner man. He was for the most part painfully grave. . . . He took his share in conversation, and talked, ably and well of course, but with such scrupulous solicitude to think exactly what he should, and say exactly what he thought, that he spoke with an appearance of effort and as if with an impediment of the mind." Such a man was not likely to make an effective speaker either on the platform or in Parliament. Sir Henry's description of Southey talking French is amusing:—"He speaks the language—as he says—without shame or remorse; and never man dashed on in such fearful defiance of pronunciation and all the parts of speech." Southey himself admits this in the following quatrain:—

Here we call for Bread and Butter,  
Thanks for it in French we utter;  
Better Bread was never broken,  
Worser French was never spoken.

<sup>6</sup> "*Autobiography of Sir Henry Taylor, 1800-1875.*" In 2 vols. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1885.

Sir Henry mentions having written "a clever and malapert article" in 1823 for the *Quarterly*, on Earl Russell as a poet. The Earl afterwards told Sir Henry "that the article was very useful to him, as showing him that it was not to poetry, but to politics, he was to devote himself." This remark of Samuel Rogers is eminently characteristic:—"He observed to me that it matters very little whom one marries, for one finds next day one has married somebody else." We learn from these volumes that Cardinal Manning was for a short time a junior clerk in the Colonial Office; and we read for the first time a cynical remark of a Roman Catholic belonging to the party in the Church to "which the Cardinal is anything but acceptable, that the greatest misfortune the Roman Church has suffered in this century was the death of *Mrs. Manning*." We can only find further space for what seems to us an exaggerated estimate of Charles Greville as "a man who was perhaps, on the whole, and certainly in some important qualifications, more fitted, if not more likely, to have been First Minister than at least three of the First Ministers of his generation."

We have read with very great interest Captain Stumm's sketch<sup>7</sup> of the advance of Russia into Central Asia up to the year 1872. It is curious to notice that in the commencement of the Russian relations with the nomads the protection of Russia was earnestly invited by the very tribes who afterwards offered the most desperate resistance to her progress—a progress which, as the writer most clearly proves, was forced upon her in pure self-defence against the plundering raids of the wandering tribes and the Turkoman pirates of the Caspian, always encouraged by the Khan of Khiva, in whose markets the captives and plunder so obtained were sold. In the year 1839 an expedition, organized and equipped with great care and forethought, was sent against Khiva, but, owing to the unprecedented severity of the season, was obliged to return without success, after wandering for eight months on the frozen steppes and undergoing almost incredible hardships. The Khivans, however, were so impressed by the energy and endurance of their adversary that, on receiving intelligence of the projected despatch of a second expedition, they voluntarily surrendered their prisoners and entered into a treaty of peace. In a few years, however, the plundering raids were recommenced, and partly in consequence of the loss in 1849 of a second expedition in the snow, the advance was recommenced in 1853 by way of the Sea of Aral. By 1863 the Russians had pushed their boundary up to the Syr Daria, and in 1864 columns starting respectively from the sea of Aral and Western Siberia joined hands and captured Tashkend. In 1866 the Emir of Bokhara was decisively defeated, and Khokand taken. In 1867 the Emir, being again defeated, concluded a peace with Russia, which has continued to the present time. Captain Stumm brings his narrative to a conclusion by an exceedingly well-written account of the explorations conducted

<sup>7</sup> "Russia in Central Asia." By Hugo Stumm, Captain Hessian Hussars, &c. Translated by J. W. Ozanne and Captain Sachs. London: Harrison & Sons. 1885.

by Markosoff, Skobeleff, and others as a preliminary to the projected attack on Khiva. The remainder of the volume is devoted partly to a description of the armies of the provinces of the Caucasus, Turkestan, and Orenburg, down to the year 1875, and partly to an account of the physical characteristics of the country, its natural productions, the various races which unite to form its population, &c., with which particulars Vambéry, MacGahan, and O'Donovan have already made us familiar. We shall look forward with pleasure to the account of the Khiva expedition promised in a future volume.

Two big volumes of nearly 500 pages each for a period of six years. At this rate, Dr. von Holst's "History of America,"<sup>1</sup> if ever brought up to the present time, will be about the size of an encyclopædia. That the work is thoroughly done is a matter of course, and the translation is much more readable than translations from German often are. The contest about slavery between the North and South in Congress and in the new Territories is narrated with a fulness that leaves nothing to be desired. Respect for American politicians is not increased by reading such a full and candid account of their doings, but the thought is forced upon one that, in modern times, the nation and circumstances are stronger than politicians. When a great speech like Sumner's on the troubles in Kansas could only be answered by a murderous attack which was defended by the newspapers of the slavery party, it is clear that nothing but a war (for secession, if permitted, would probably have led to a war sooner or later) could produce ultimate peace. Dr. von Holst's sympathies are strongly in favour of the anti-slavery party, which perhaps colours his estimate of men and their doings, but he cannot be said to be unjust. The book will no doubt be widely read in America, and in England it will be a necessity to any one who wishes to understand the strife of principles and interests which produced the most dreadful civil war the world has ever seen—a war which, however necessary, was a national sin which it will take long years to expiate.

It is not surprising that the English force in the Soudan shared the mystification of the British public as to what the war was about. "I do not believe," says "An Officer Who Was There," "that there was a man in the whole of this magnificent force who could have given you any intelligible reason for which we were fighting, if indeed his ingenuity enabled him to give you any reason at all." The ingenuity of a great many persons in England could lead them no farther than to suppose that the object was to cover a Ministry, whose power and popularity were waning, with a little cheap military glory, as they expected. As to cost, the loss in camels in two days' fighting was £17,765, and the mismanagement was so gross, and the results so worthless, that the people of England will be untrue to their own interests if they ever place

<sup>1</sup> "The Constitutional and Political History of the United States." By Dr. H. von Holst. Translated from the German by J. J. Lalor. Chicago: Callaghan & Co. 1885.

<sup>2</sup> "Suakin, 1885." By An Officer Who Was There. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1885.

sufficient power in the hands of those who were responsible, to enable them again to commit a like blunder or a like crime, whichever one may please to call it. The "Officer Who Was There," though writing cheerfully enough about personal hardship, is constantly complaining of gross carelessness and mismanagement in the authorities. The arrangement of the camp about Suakin was such that "it appeared to us as if every one had been allowed to take his choice, and regimental camps were scattered about pretty much like plums in a cake, and with just about as much foresight on the part of the chief cook." Three circular redoubts were thrown up in such a position that "men firing from them at all must, in spite of every precaution, have fired into some camp or other, either in front or to the right or left." In one night attack,

how we escaped being all killed is a mystery. Suffice it to say, that we stood up there and watched the Indians fire volleys by squads clean into us, and we could count the number of men firing by the flashes, as they were not more than 500 yards off. The firing from this side must have been infectious, for we very soon afterwards found ourselves under a cross fire from the cavalry redoubts on the other. A pleasant variety of bullets was now cutting up the ground at our feet—the Indians firing with Sniders and the cavalry with Martini-Henry carbines. Our chief work was to prevent a stampede among our horses, but, I am thankful to say, the firing was at length stopped before any serious damage was done, and we came out of action with our friends with the loss of a mule only. We, on our part, put the whole thing down to General Funk's account, as we saw nothing ourselves and never fired a shot.

Then, again, when Lancer regiments were especially wanted, the 9th Bengal Cavalry, whose arms are a sword and carbine, were sent out, with lances indeed, but totally untrained, so that in action they threw away their lances and drew their swords, a weapon which is of very little use against a spear and shield. Over and over again the "Officer" congratulates the army that the transport, consisting of many hundred camels, was not attacked, as it was allowed to march without any guard, when the enemy's power of concealment and rapid movement were so notorious that it was never known where he might be next. The medical staff, on whom so much depended, suffered from similar official carelessness. They were housed in single bell tents, which are almost unbearable even in England in hot weather, and, though one of the newspaper reporters mentioned this in his telegram home, the press censor struck it out as not the case. The soldiers, on the other hand, seem to have behaved admirably. "A hundred different duties fell to his lot, cooking, branding, fatigues innumerable, digging entrenchments in the very heat of the day, pitching tents, going on guard, watching all night under a heavy fire, and many other things besides. He got through them all, though, and was always to be heard chaffing and laughing, for he is a good fellow, Tommy Atkins, though he is bound to have a grumble and a growl sometimes, for 'tis his rights." Here are three portraits; no names are given, but military men will have no difficulty in identification:—

The first of these was a very tall, broad-shouldered man, with a certain shrewd look in his face, with a kindly manner and a soldierly bearing. The

double line of ribbons across his jacket showed him to be a man who had seen a deal of active service, and amongst his ribbons was the most prized of all orders, though now becoming a little too common. He always seemed very grave, as if he bore on his shoulders the weight of some overpowering responsibilities, and he certainly acted on the principle that silence was golden, for he told his staff nothing, and, they say, consulted nobody. One of his personal staff once told me that they never knew an hour beforehand when a move was going to take place, and that this reserve was carried so far that they never even knew what time they were going to have their dinners. Report put him down as a man who had studied deeply, and who was well versed in the science of war. His pluck in action and his excessive coolness under fire were undeniable, but his reputation as a general was somewhat slender. We all liked him because of his many attractive qualities, and above all he was a true friend and a perfect gentleman. He might have been popular, but his somewhat cold manner and habitual reserve rather repelled any advances, and there was none of that spontaneous *bonhomie* and happy manner with his troops which, while it sacrifices nothing to discipline, wins for a commander the love of his soldiers.

The second figure was different altogether from the first. He was of middle stature, somewhat stout, and with a round, red, good-humoured face. He too wore many ribbons, and possessed also the red one of the Victoria Cross. He had a somewhat quick, sharp way of asking questions, and a somewhat standoff manner with strangers, though when you knew him there was no pleasanter companion or kinder-hearted friend. He possessed also an attractive manner, and a cool quiet way of taking things, which made him to a certain extent popular. He looked as though he had the constitution of a giant, and as if he could stand or go through with anything. He was always perfectly self-satisfied, and even when things went against him he acted as though it was all *couleur de rose* and rather a good thing for him. As to any qualifications to command—these were shown in after-days. I ought to mention his right-hand man—a true soldier and energetic staff officer, unhampered by rule and the trammels of red tape, and with the inestimable quality of perfect readiness to accept responsibility and total fearlessness of the consequences. Everybody liked him, and though he had a quick temper he never lost it, and if you wanted anything done, he did his best to help you, sinking personal considerations before all others.

As to the third, he was a short, sharp-featured individual, with a pompous and rather disagreeable manner, a loud voice, a quick temper, and a sense of his own importance which defied everything. He was not popular, and he seemed generally to be absorbed in that wonderful thought, "I am." A short answer was all you ever received from him, and one which often fell far short of ordinary courtesy.

There was one thing which these three characters had in common, though utterly dissimilar in every other respect—one tie which bound them together as representatives of a fraternity—they were members of the same Society.

M. Montet's book on the Literature of the Vaudois of Piedmont<sup>10</sup> has a double interest, religious and linguistic. Of some of the heresies ascribed to them by Catholic authors no trace is to be found in the acknowledged writings of the sect. The Italian Vaudois were so much more opposed to the Roman Church than their French brethren that it has been asserted they had a different origin, and that Arnold of Brescia, not Peter Waldez, was their true founder. Originally the Vaudois

<sup>10</sup> "Histoire littéraire des Vaudois du Piémont." Par Edouard Montet. Paris: Librairie Fischbacher. 1885.

were not doctrinally heretical. They used their Bible as a source of edification and a moral teacher, not, as did the Albigeois, as an arsenal from which to get weapons to defend their opinions. At a later time, Hussite influence was felt, and this is shown by manuscripts of the same gloss on the Pater Noster, in which the earlier speak of the Real Presence, while later scribes have substituted for the passage a refutation of the doctrine. The Book of Virtues and Vices seems also to assume the power of absolution in the priest. Most of the books which M. Montet has discovered have not much originality in them. Centos of texts and passages from the Fathers form a large proportion. But some of the verse has a simplicity and grace which would hardly be expected. Here are some stanzas from a poem on the Parable of the Sower:—

Lo semenador lo seo semencz semenava :  
 Luna tombe en la via : fruc non germenava :  
 E non poya naiser, la reycz non apilhava :  
 Li ome la calpisavan, li oysel la devoravan.  
 L'autre entre las peyras non faczia profeictançza  
 Sentent la calor seche sença demorancza  
 L'autre entre las spinas hac grant soffogancza  
 E non poya far fruc ni bona comportançza.

The following is from a poem on Death:—

Tot czo ques crea de carn la mort destruy e auci  
 Ilh apremis li grant e li petit asi  
 Ilh ten de li noble la poysencza  
 E non ha dalcun neuna marczeneciancza.  
 A li duc e a li princi ilh es mot cuminal.  
 A jove asi a vell ilh non vol pardonar  
 Par alcun enging non po scampar lo fort  
 Qu'el non sia atrissa sot lo pe de la mort.

As in Spanish, the rhymes are made by the vowel sounds, the consonants being of no consequence; for instance, *cuminal* and *pardonar* rhyme. It will be seen that the dialect is Provençal, but differs from the tongue of the Troubadours and that of the Albigenses. There was a careful treatise on it about twenty years ago by M. Gruzmacher, in Herrig's *Archiv*, which should be looked at by any one interested in the subject. All dialects of Old French are attracting attention now, even in Sweden, and contributions like this will be welcomed.

The Corporation of London deserve great credit for the public spirit they show in the treatment of their records. It is difficult to persuade the officials of some towns even to allow their archives to be reported on by the Historical Manuscripts Commission, which costs them nothing; but London has gone to the expense of printing (we wish we could say publishing as well) a most interesting selection of letters of the fourteenth century from their records,<sup>11</sup> and, in order to make them intelligible to every one who takes an interest in the early history of his city, they are not printed in the original Latin and

<sup>11</sup> "Calendar of Letters from the Mayor and Corporation of the City of London." By R. R. Sharpe, D.C.L. London: J. C. Francis. 1885.

French, but in the shape of full abstracts in English, with an introduction by Dr. Sharpe calling attention to the chief points of interest. Many of the letters refer to the exemption of citizens of London from toll in other towns—an exemption which was granted also to tenants of some of the larger abbeys and of bishops and other folk so generously that one wonders who it was that paid the toll. Others refer to the trade with Flanders, Bordeaux, and foreign countries in general. Students of municipal institutions will find a useful hint in the letter from Oxford asking for information about London customs; and many other kindred subjects receive valuable illustration. It is to be hoped that this is only a first instalment, and that other valuable material of the same kind may be brought to light under the same editorship.

The lighter muse of history is the cult of Mr. Ewald.<sup>12</sup> His is not the function to discuss intricate points of constitutional history, but to place before the public the actors in the great drama of the world's progress in the guise in which they appeared to their friends and associates. No one is a hero to his *valet-de-chambre*, and the divinity which doth hedge a king melts, like the morning mist before the sun, when exposed to the full light of contemporary evidence. Not that Mr. Ewald's tone is cynical or severe. By no means—it is pleasant and cheery. But—going as he does beyond the ordinary sources of information, and having no pre-conceived theories to bolster up or purpose to serve—kings, and queens, and statesmen appear in his pages as men and women, instead of dressed-up lay figures moving about with a set purpose like chess-men. The essays were so well received on their first appearance in various magazines that there is no need to call special attention to them here, except to say that this reprint has had the advantage of a careful revision, is well printed, and has a good Index.

On a perusal of "The History of Herod"<sup>13</sup> we cannot but admit that although the writer adds no new matter to the story told by Josephus, the solitary authority (it may well be said) upon the subject, and that although he takes the part of an advocate rather than a judge, yet his reading of the text is so fair, and the consequent inferences so reasonable, that he may justly be held to have earned for his client the favourable verdict of posterity. It must be carefully borne in mind that Herod the Great was an Eastern ruler, living in revolutionary times, and ruling over subjects noted for their fanatical and turbulent spirit. None but an able soldier, a consummate diplomatist, and a just statesman could have acquired, as he undoubtedly did, the confidence of the successive rulers of the Roman world and the respect of his subjects, as evinced by the tranquillity of his kingdom during the greater part of a long reign and the anarchy which followed his death. Mr. Vickers contrasts him, not without justice, with the principal monarchs of Judah and Israel, with the result that in no point

<sup>12</sup> "Studies Restudied." By Alexander Charles Ewald, F.S.A. London: Chatto & Windus. 1885.

<sup>13</sup> "The History of Herod; or, Another Look at a Man emerging from Twenty Centuries of Calumny." By John Vickers. London: Williams & Norgate. 1885. [Vol. CXXIV. No. CCXLVIII.]—NEW SERIES, Vol. LXVIII. No. II. P P



is he worse, and in many or most is he distinctly better, than the most renowned of his predecessors. While their sins have been treated with tenderness by the historians, his have been wilfully exaggerated; and we cannot but think that there is much force in the author's contention that, if Herod had had the good fortune of David and the Asmonean princes in securing the support of the sacerdotal party, his name would have been handed down to posterity as that of a monarch second not even to Solomon, as the builder of the third and most magnificent of the temples which successively crowned Mount Moriah. The idea that he was a cruel tyrant and the perpetrator of the Massacre of the Innocents would not even have entered the heads of his reverend chroniclers. As a matter of fact, the legend of the Bethlehem slaughter was probably inspired by the older legend which describes the saving of Moses, and, as a matter of chronology, it is now pretty generally agreed that Herod died four years before the birth of Christ, so that if he indeed ordered the massacre his prophetic powers must have been of no mean order. As to other cruelties alleged against him, little more can be said than that the customs of the age were cruel, and that he was not more, indeed less, cruel than his contemporaries. Of his conduct to Mariamne, again we must remember that we are dealing with Orientals. Her apologists must admit that she had repeatedly engaged in fomenting revolt against her husband, and that her ultimate fate was but a question of time if she continued to pursue the dangerous course upon which she was embarked. Herod's household was neither better nor worse than those of the Sultan of Turkey or the Shah of Persia at the present day—very hot-beds of corruption and intrigue. Our thanks are due to Mr. Vickers for having produced an exceedingly lively and well-written account of the epoch. We would especially commend to the attention of our readers the chapter upon the Jewish priest rule; also to the manner in which our author points out the strong analogies between the Roman rule in Palestine and our relations at the present day with the subject-princes in Hindostan. The parallel between the Jews and the Irish Nationalists is also not without humour. In conclusion, we would quote, as appropriate to Mr. Vickers' hero, the words of the Fair Maid of Perth: "Thy faults are those of this cruel remorseless age, thy virtues are all thine own."

The essays and miscellaneous writings of Vere Henry Lord Hobart, with the biographical sketch,<sup>14</sup> which, however, is far more a record of tastes and opinions, prefixed to them, afford ample materials for an estimate of the author's life and character. All readers of these two volumes will, we think, feel that he was a most estimable man, capable of rendering a reason for his opinions and honest in the avowal of them, even though they should widely dissent from his views and be inclined to place him in that class of men to whom, borrowing from the enemy, he himself applies the terms "soft-hearted," "utopian," and

<sup>14</sup> "Essays and Miscellaneous Writings by Vere Henry Lord Hobart." With a Biographical Sketch. Edited by Mary Lady Hobart. In 2 vols. London: Macmillan & Co. 1885.

"visionary." The Jingo will certainly have no pleasure in him; nevertheless, there is in his political essays a certain reasonableness and good sense which might even affect the minds of those who, to use his own definition of them, "sing 'Rule Britannia,' and in so doing experience a thrill of conscious virtue and a comfortable sense of duty done which confirms them in the practice," and to whose consideration the contrast which he draws between "patriotism the vice" and "patriotism the virtue" may perhaps be usefully commended. To state a few of the conclusions which he arrived at and advocated will be enough to show what manner of man he was: for example, parliamentary reform and redistribution on the lines of Mr. Hare's scheme, arbitration in place of war where at all possible, and abolition of capital punishment for murder. Or for this purpose we may cite his estimate of Mr. Cobden, of whom he writes, "It is long since there left the world any one who deserved so well of it as Richard Cobden;" and again, "Of Cobden's career there are results which none can gainsay—vast, signal, and comprehensive, they disarm alike both competition and criticism." For twenty years of his life, notwithstanding that his father in the interval had succeeded to the title of the Earl of Buckinghamshire, Lord Hobart occupied a subordinate position in the office of the Board of Trade. At an early period of his career, however, he accompanied Sir Henry Ellis as secretary on a diplomatic mission to the Emperor of Brazil, and afterwards throughout his official life was closely associated with his relative, Lord Ripon, and other Cabinet Ministers in the position of private secretary. In 1851 he was entrusted with a mission to investigate the condition of the Turkish finances. After his retirement from the Board of Trade he was made Director General of the Ottoman Bank; and, finally, in 1872 he was appointed Governor of the Madras Presidency, in which position, three years afterwards, he was suddenly struck down and his useful career ended by typhoid fever. The letters and minutes relating to his administration in Madras, which was fruitful of important results to the Presidency, form an essential part of the second volume. They have been carefully edited by Mr. Carmichael, chief secretary to the Madras Government during the last year of Lord Hobart's life. The only exception to be taken to the manner in which Mr. Carmichael has performed his task is perhaps to question the profitableness of citing, as he does, testimonials to Lord Hobart's character and work, which remind one somewhat of the advertising skill of a patent-medicine vendor, and which would scarcely seem to have been necessary. Though the graver aspects of Lord Hobart's life and character merit chief notice, to end with them would be to give an imperfect idea of him, for the papers classed as "Fragments" testify to excellent capacities of taste and feeling and powers of description of a high order. He was, besides, not wanting in poetical ability, as is to be perceived, not alone in the specimens of his verse which Lady Hobart has furnished, but also in such studies of nature as are to be found in "A Trip to Scotland" and "A Chapter on the Sea." The two portraits which Lady Hobart has prefixed to the volumes add completeness to the reader's conception of her husband's personality.

An unpretentious volume containing letters written by Lord Beaconsfield<sup>15</sup> when, more than fifty years ago, he set out, as a young man in search of health, on his travels to Gibraltar and the East, must necessarily attract universal attention, while to those who wish to be wise after the event it will afford an excellent opportunity of detecting characteristics prophetic of much that marked the distinguished statesman's future career. But possibly in this respect the letters may be taken too seriously, for there are indications that in the freedom of familiar correspondence he felt it to be permissible to indulge in a certain amount of exaggerated statement and "tall talk." However, his adventures and the scenes he passed through were sufficiently picturesque, and were such as evidently met with, from him, the keenest appreciation. Few young men, it may be supposed, ever prosecuted their journeyings under more favourable circumstances. Welcomed everywhere, either on account of the elder Disraeli's reputation, or as being himself the "supposed author of—what is it?—I forget," bearing letters of introduction to the most influential personages, and himself not backward to make the best of any and every advantage, he managed to obtain all the social attention and enjoyment which he could possibly desire. He naively relates how he played the oddest pranks, condescending even to "buffooneries," in order to attract attention to himself, and to enable him to make a sensation and take the lead, or to maintain "his reputation of being a great judge of costume." Thus he says, "I have also the fame of being the first who ever passed the Straits with two canes, a morning and an evening cane. I change my cane as the gun fires, and hope to carry them both on to Cairo. It is wonderful the effect these magical wands produce." One wonders what the mental calibre of the subalterns at Gibraltar could have been to whom young Disraeli's "new studs" were objects of "envy and admiration." But then it must be remembered that it is the owner who thus writes of the astonishing effect of his mother's brilliant present. Disraeli's love for costume appears, indeed, throughout the letters; at all times, costume has an attraction for him, whether on his own fair person or on that of an attendant. At Malta he dines at the mess of the 73rd in an Andalusian dress. From the same place comes this message: "Tell Ralph . . . his handkerchief which he brought me from Paris is the most successful thing I ever wore, and universally admired." To this brother he writes: "You should see me in the costume of a Greek pirate. A blood-red shirt, with silver studs as big as shillings, an immense scarf for girdle full of pistols and daggers, red cap, red slippers, broad blue striped jacket and trousers." And again, at Yanina, he records, with gratification, that with the united assistance of his English, Spanish, and fancy wardrobe he had produced a most extraordinary effect on the costume-loving people of the place; while, later on, he writes of a favourite servant who was about to leave him, that the man's departure, specially disagreeable at the moment, "would

<sup>15</sup> "Home Letters written by the late Earl of Beaconsfield in 1830 and 1831." Second Edition. London: John Murray. 1885.

annoy me at all times, because he wore a Mameluke dress of crimson and gold, with a white turban thirty yards long, and a sabre glittering like a rainbow. I must now content myself with an Arab attendant in a blue shirt and slipperless." The letters, however, are not wholly concerned with topics of this kind. They contain young Disraeli's confident criticisms of men and manners; they relate many amusing incidents; and run into flowing and enthusiastic descriptions of places and scenes, though he says more than once of his descriptions that they were not offered as descriptions, but as memoranda for further details, to be enlarged upon to the loved family circle round the wood fire in the hall of his home at Bradenham. The "true lawyer" will feel flattered to be defined as a person "ever illustrating the obvious, explaining the evident, and expatiating on the common-place." Disraeli's visit to Gibraltar and Malta opened his eyes, so he says, to the real life of a *militaire*. "By heavens! I believe these fellows are boys till they are majors, and sometimes do not even stop there." Descriptions of incidents and scenes are too long to quote; an enumeration of some of the places visited by him, however—Andalusia, Granada, Malta, Corfu (from whence he paid a visit to the Grand Vizier of Turkey at Yanina), Athens, Constantinople, Jerusalem, Alexandria, Cairo, the Nile—will be sufficient to show how much there would be during his months of travel to excite his emotions and to give employment to his pen. Whatever else, also, this little volume reveals, it discloses a most affectionate attachment to the "folks at home."

The authors of the new Life of Raphael<sup>16</sup> have taken as the foundation of their work a thorough study of Raphael's sketches all over Europe. Sometimes these show us how he educated himself for his art, and the different influences under which he came, how he began to draw under the tuition of his father and Perugino, and widened the scope of his powers by intercourse with Lionardo da Vinci and Michelangelo, and by studying the remains of classical sculpture and architecture at Rome. Sometimes the sketches prove or corroborate biographical facts. His visit to Città di Castello, for instance, is proved by finding two of the archers from Signorelli's St. Sebastian in the gallery at Oxford; and, conversely, the knowledge of the time when he must have gone to Città di Castello helps us to date this and many other sketches. An extraordinary power of observation and comparison, and a thorough knowledge of the art of Raphael and his contemporaries, appear in every page of the book, and the only thing it lacks to make it perfect is a few facsimiles to illustrate the authors' theories and reasoning.

The evils of ecclesiastical government are told in the most forcible language in the new biography of San Carlo Borromeo.<sup>17</sup> The life of such a man can hardly be written with impartiality by any one, and certainly not by an Italian. Signor di Villafiora is a determined

<sup>16</sup> "Raphael: his Life and Works." By J. A. Crowe and G. B. Cavalcaselle. In 2 vols. London: John Murray. 1885.

<sup>17</sup> "Vita di San Carlo Borromeo." Da Cino di Villafiora. Milano: G. Civelli. 1885.

enemy of the Church, or perhaps we may say of the abuses of the Church, and his book has therefore rather too polemical a tone for most English readers. But then it is so long since English people have been troubled with a man who was at once Abbot, Prior, Cardinal Archbishop, and disposer of all ecclesiastical benefices, without having taken priest's orders himself, that we look at these things in a much more philosophical spirit. Besides the biographies of Sala and Locatelli, the author has had the advantage of consulting the ecclesiastical archives of Milan, in which he has found many letters of the Cardinal, and other documents which throw additional light on his life and doings.

Mr. Cappon<sup>18</sup> has pointed out one of the principal reasons of Victor Hugo's great influence for good, both in France and elsewhere, by reminding us of a saying of his in 1830, that, were he a politician, his first demand would be that social questions should be substituted for political ones. It is a saying that has borne fruit since. Men are beginning to learn that questions of dynasties or of forms of government are not of such importance as the principles on which legislation is based, and whether the laws tend to stunt or to promote individual progress and the free development of the race. It is not much good having a share in the government if the government is a tyrant, a thing that depends more on the character of the people than their political *régime*. And Hugo was one of those whose liberalism is founded on faith in humanity and its power of improvement. Though "a Prophet complicated by a Parisian," there is no tone of Ecclesiastes in his writings, for he was full of "the optimism of a life spent in high and successful energy." Even when in exile, he never lost faith in the ultimate success of the cause to which he devoted his life. Mr. Cappon has written just the kind of book which will tempt those who know little of Hugo to read his writings, especially his poetry, of which a good many typical specimens are given, with translations. These, unfortunately, are very poor; the sense sacrificed for the sake of verse, which is bad as bad can be. If Hugo were still alive, and knew English, what would he have said to this, as representing his splendid "Song of the Ancient Gaul"?—

O ! quand mon tour viendra de suivre mes victimes,  
Guerriers ! ne laissez pas ma dépouille au corbeau ;  
Ensevelissez moi parmi les monts sublimes,  
Afin que l'étranger cherche en voyant leurs cimes  
Quelle montagne est mon tombeau.

Oh when my day has come to follow those I've slain,  
Warriors, my carrion shall not rot on the ground ;  
But bury me amongst those mountains high and bleak,  
So that the stranger, when he sees a distant peak,  
May be told that there is my mound.

And the following, from "Les Chatiments," is perhaps worse:—

<sup>18</sup> "Victor Hugo." By James Cappon, M.A. Edinburgh and London : Blackwood & Sons. 1885 ;

A l'eau les chiens ! le cerf qui brame  
Se perd dans l'ombre du bassin.

Hear the stag-bell, the hounds follow well  
To the shade of the bay he doth turn.

And yet Mr. Cappon says that he appreciates "the impetuous rhythm and the wild melancholy sentiment," and no doubt he does, though to print such stuff is not a good way of showing it. The author himself is rather too prone to fine writing, and it sometimes leads him into strange vagaries. "The scales in which the god of battle weighs nations are not so unjust. The march of the Germans on Paris was no sin against light and civilization, but really the simplest method of proving for us and for after-ages what kind of force there is in French society, and what kind there is not, and was, in all seriousness, a very proper reply to the endless vaunting of many Frenchmen." The first clause is a neat paraphrase of Napoleon's saying, that Providence is on the side of the biggest battalions, but spoilt by the introduction of a moral idea which is out of place coupled with the Carlylese cynicism of the conclusion.

# BELLES LETTRES.

A COLLECTION of ballads and poems published by the Glasgow Ballad Club<sup>1</sup> contains much that well deserves publication. The name and composition of the volume suggested the amateur and all his works, but for once we were agreeably disappointed. We prefer the ballads proper, which are based for the most part on ancient Scottish legend, to the shorter poems, which are either poems of the affections or contain excellent but somewhat trite moralities and moralizings. It might seem alike invidious and impossible to arrange these ninety odd ballads in anything like order of merit, but we have attempted to pick out the most successful, or at any rate those which were the first to take our fancy. On the whole, we assign the palm to Mr. William Canton, whose three ballads—"After the Battle," "Kozma the Smith," and "The Dead Cid"—are all full of merit. The most pathetic ballad in the collection is "Last Words," by Mr. David Wingate. It might be described as a model temperance poem if it did not differ from that class of literature both in respect of persuasiveness and delicacy of treatment. The Irish ballads of Mr. J. Gilkinson—"The O'Harman's Gate" and "The Skinning of the Ould Cow"—are in the style of the "Ingoldsby Legends," and may almost take rank with them. Mr. William Freeland, in "The Flight of the Ballad-makers" and the "Peeseweep Inn," records the holiday adventures of the Club. English readers who do not love the "Shepherd" of the "Noctes" will perhaps take exception to these perfunctory descrip-

<sup>1</sup> "Ballads and Poems." By Members of the Glasgow Ballad Club. Edinburgh and London : William Blackwood & Sons. 1865.

tions of Scottish literary revelry, but the "wiser mind" will read on with patience, "contented if it may enjoy the things which others understand." We quote the following stanzas on the funeral of Thomas Carlyle, by Mr. James Hendry, not as a sample of the collection, but on account of their own merits :—

### FUNERAL OF THOMAS CARLYLE.

*Ecclefechan, 10th February, 1881.*

(FROM A WATER-COLOUR PAINTING BY R. W. ALLAN.)

Slow tolls the bell beneath the sombre sky ;  
 Slow spreads the hush along the still grey light :  
 They bring him dead who shall not surely die,—  
 They bring him home across the wintry white—  
     Here where the poor folk wait,  
     Silent, beside the gate.

This narrow gateway in the churchyard wall ;  
 These simple village folk to bow the head ;  
 The land made fair with snow : and over all  
 A low grey cloud : so bring they home the dead.  
     Drear as it thus befell,  
     He would have deemed it well.

Stand hushed, ye kindly folk, and let him pass ;  
 Long hath he toiled who comes to take his peace.  
 The man was great ; yet little men, alas !  
 Shall scorn his height soon as these death-bells cease.  
     But he shall safely in  
     Beside his silent kin.

Slow tolls the bell beneath the sombre sky ;  
 Slow comes the hearse against the still grey light :  
 They bring him dead who shall not surely die ;  
 They bring him home when all the land is white ;—  
     Yet sun-swept grass shall grow  
     Where now is mounded snow.

In "Loved beyond Words"<sup>2</sup> Mr. George Barlow is profuse, monotonous, and extravagant, but in comparison with other works of his which we have noticed from time to time the present volume is sane and temperate. There is a reaching after wholesomeness and sobriety for which we cannot but be thankful, and though Mr. Barlow is still very far removed from artistic self-control he wears his "wisp of hay" with a difference. We never struggle through Mr. Barlow's effusions without a keen regret "that this waste should be made." A man has an unusual command of language and a faculty of rhyme, and he throws the one and the other away upon the expression of feeling which belongs to sacred silence, or upon some *bizarrie* which affords him the childish satisfaction of giving offence to the average reader.

<sup>2</sup> "Loved beyond Words." By George Barlow. London : Remington & Co. 1885.

If Mr. Barlow would write more poems like "A Vision" (p. 96), and cease either to vilipend or to patronise the Deity, it would bring comfort to reviewers and others.

"Under-current and After-glow: an Elegy of England," is a disappointing production. It is full of noble and beautiful thoughts, and no one could have written it who had not the spirit of poetry in his heart; but the whole poem lacks coherence and purpose, and the style is heavy, monotonous, and obscure. Bristol and the river Avon form apparently the occasion for a series of rhythmical dissertations on Milton, Cromwell, Carlyle, Burke, Wordsworth, Coleridge, General Gordon, and other English writers and heroes. Mr. Arden, if that be a real name, has something interesting to say on all these subjects, but he always shrinks from telling a plain tale, and he deals in such sesquipedalian abstractions that the labour of reading and comprehending his verse is fatal to enjoyment.

"Bits of Brazil," by Mr. John Cameron Grant, are poetical photographs of tropical scenery, much in the style of the author's "Prairie Pictures." To observe with something like scientific accuracy, and to describe in more or less musical verse the scenery of unknown lands, is at any rate to win a hearing. It is impossible to read Mr. Grant's verses and not gain some images of strange and novel beauties. But Mr. Grant should remember that the only excuse he has for relating his experiences in verse is that they are of a kind that need transporting out of the realm of fact into that of fancy. For instance, here is a poetical description of palm-trees, which has its value as such:—

They stand against the sunset and lift their wings on high,  
With never a shadow cast by the glory round on the sod,  
As angels stand too rapt for word, or prayer, or cry,  
Silent in adoration before the Heaven of God!

But the following stanza, though it describes things of beauty, is far from being either beautiful or poetical in itself:—

And the deep green stephanotis, with flowers as white as the sap  
The cut tree-rubber gives, trails over the lesser stones,  
Where those humming-birds of dusk, the great grey hawkmoths, tap  
The luscious flowers, or visit the cactus diadems.

Now it is required of poets that they should be seers and not observers only.

In the making of verses, so far from practice making perfect, it is too often the case that a first effort is the last success. Mr. Douglas B. W. Sladen's new volume, "In Cornwall and across the Sea"\*

\* "Under-current and After-glow: an Elegy of England." By Maurice Arden. London: G. Bell & Sons. Clifton: J. Baker & Son.

† "Bits of Brazil, the Legend of Lilith, and other Poems." By John Cameron Grant. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1885.

‡ "In Cornwall and across the Sea." By Douglas B. W. Sladen, author of "Frithjof and Ingebjorg," &c. London: Griffith, Farran, Oksden & Welsh. 1885.



is an instance to the contrary. The advance on Mr. Sladen's earlier verses, not only in respect of metrical skill and refinement of expression, but in depth and meaning, is as conspicuous as it is unusual. The Australian poems, the "Ballad of Wattle Blossom" and "Cooper of Tumut," are in their several ways genuinely characteristic, and bring new impressions to the mind of the reader. The sonnets descriptive of Devonshire and Cornwall bring familiar scenes before the eye, and want nothing but finish to be completely successful. Mr. Sladen still writes on too many subjects, and on too slight a provocation. If he will impose limits on himself, and eschew subjects not susceptible of poetic treatment, he may hereafter give us verse of a high order. He wants the critical rather than the creative faculty.

The "Age of Lead : a Twenty Years' Retrospect,"<sup>6</sup> relates in doggerel verse the rise and triumph of Prince Bismarck. The author intimates the possibility of a downfall. It is sad stuff.

Mr. Arthur Galton, in "Studies of Five Living Poets,"<sup>7</sup> desires to approach the subjects of his essays solely from a literary point of view. Whatever is personal, or matter of opinion, he regards as *nihil ad rem*, and bids us look to the poets' works for our measure of the poets' worth. Is this, we may ask, an unusual method, and has it indeed been left for the higher criticism to lay down so obvious a canon? In an introductory essay, Mr. Galton claims for the five great poets of the present age—Lord Tennyson, Mr. Browning, Mr. Matthew Arnold, Mr. Swinburne, and Mr. Morris—a comparatively new faculty, a faculty which he designates as at once critical and constructive, by which the poet can re-enter the past and make it live again for us. Older poets, he intimates, were 'hide-bound, and more or less incapable of doing this. Lord Tennyson, who is, we suspect, a little too old-fashioned for Mr. Galton, is, we are told, perfect mainly as a word-painter; Mr. Browning—and in this essay Mr. Galton, though not enthusiastic, is acute and temperate—is a master of mental anatomy; but, alas for the exclusion of matter of opinion! Mr. Matthew Arnold is the divine poet who passes all the tests and fulfils all the conditions of critical perfection. We, too, are enthusiastic admirers of Mr. Arnold's poetry, and, like Mr. Galton, we feel the charm of all Mr. Arnold's writings, but we are sure that Mr. Arnold himself would be the first to point out that the true criterion of a great poet is the indefinable quality of greatness, and that purity and severity and evenness all weigh as nothing in the balance against the "weight of glory" which one of the Immortals can throw into the scale. In spite of some affectation of style and some platitudes, these essays are interesting and suggestive.

The "Spirit of Goethe's Faust,"<sup>8</sup> by W. A. Coupland, is an attempt,

<sup>6</sup> "The Age of Lead : a Twenty Years' Retrospect." In Three Fyttes. Second Edition. Edinburgh : David Douglas. 1885.

<sup>7</sup> "Urbana Scripta: Studies of Five Living Poets." By Arthur Galton. London : Elliot Stock. 1885.

<sup>8</sup> "The Spirit of Goethe's Faust." By William Chatterton Coupland. London : George Bell & Sons. 1885.

and we may add a successful attempt, to familiarize English readers with that fascinating and mysterious drama, the masterpiece, as some would have it, of European literature during the two last centuries. The history of the Faust legend affords an opportunity for a searching investigation into the earlier form of the myth, in the shape of religious romance or miracle play, and a brief *résumé* of the various narratives which record the "History of D. Johann Faust, the far-renowned enchanter and black artist." The conception of the philosopher wise beyond what it is given to man to know, and in league with the Spirit of Evil, is an ancient one, and at a period when the desire for new knowledge was at strife with the older sanctities of ignorance and fear the myth would not have long to wait for its realization in the actual world. It remained for one born at a period when thought was at once creative and critical to enshrine myth and legend in an allegorical drama of human life. In common with other modern critics, Mr. Coupland regards the two parts as forming a single conception, and holds that the second part is an integral portion of Goethe's original design, though he has the good sense to admit that, "in a production occupying so many years of life, the author's mind was open to fresh suggestions that led to obvious gaps and unmistakable inconsistencies." Throughout the lectures Mr. Coupland makes use of the translations of Bayard Taylor and Miss Swanwick. In an Appendix he gives a list, with brief critical notes, of all the known translations of Goethe's "Faust." They are thirty-one in all. A patient student and an enthusiastic lover of his author, Mr. Coupland avoids both pedantry and affectation.

In "Canons of Criticism" Mr. C. W. Macfarlane discusses the true nature and object of poetry, and dwells on the kindred subjects of repose, heathfulness, and humour. Mr. Matthew Arnold has defined poetry as the criticism of life; Mr. Austin asserts, on the contrary, that it is the "transfiguration of life;" while Mr. Macfarlane comes to the conclusion that "poetry is the expressing of thought by means of figure, by the substitution of the concrete for the abstract, or by the bringing together or combining of conceptions at remove because of a similarity between them, thus creating a new conception." It belongs to man's nobler instincts to attempt to define the indefinable. Poetry belongs to the emotions, and must ever elude a scientific analysis. Beautiful thoughts are poetical, and where they are expressed in beautiful words there is poetry. There is no hard-and-fast division between poetry and prose. Poetry is beauty considered in relation to things of the mind, the things that are not seen. Mr. Macfarlane's essays are acute and suggestive, but we cannot say that his style and manner are free from affectation. When a writer spells subtle "subtile," he generally means mischief.

"The Wanderings of Ulysses"<sup>10</sup> is a translation from the German

<sup>9</sup> "Canons of Criticism: an Introduction to the Development of English Poetry." By C. W. Macfarlane.

<sup>10</sup> "The Wanderings of Ulysses." By Professor C. Witt. Translated from the German by Frances Younghusband. London: Longmans, Green & Co.

of Professor Witt, by Mrs. Younghusband. The original work is a reproduction of the "Odyssey" in the form of a continuous prose narrative. Details and repetitions are omitted, and the style is of that peculiar kind of simplicity which is supposed to be intelligible by and attractive to youthful readers. Shy game of that kind will, we fear, continue to prefer Grimm and Hans Andersen, while their elders will find *their* desire for simplicity fully satisfied, if not by Homer, then by Messrs. Butcher and Lang. The translation is exceedingly well done. We can better imagine than picture the rage of the baffled school-boy who fondly dreams that he has discovered a crib.

Messrs. Ginn & Co., of Boston, U.S.A., issue a school edition of the "Seven against Thebes,"<sup>11</sup> with notes by Professor Isaac Flagg. The notes, which are brief and clear, are divided into sections in accordance with the original division of the play into *πρόλογος*, *πάροδος*, &c. The stage directions are also given. The frontispiece consists of a map of ancient Thebes.

An edition of the "Antigone" of Sophocles,<sup>12</sup> published in Athens, with Preface, Life, and critical notes in Greek, will be of interest to scholars. *ὁ Βούνδερος* and *ὁ Μυσγράβιος* have a slightly comical effect; and how it would have delighted Porson to have known that his accusative case was *πόρρωνα*! The text is based on the Codex Laurentianus. The criticism is for the most part textual. The type, which is excellent, resembles very delicate manuscript.

Messrs. Macmillan issue a "One Year Latin Course,"<sup>13</sup> edited by Mr. A. M. Cook, of St. Paul's School. The course consists of a series of exercises in the Latin grammar, as far as the end of the four conjugations—the subjunctive mood being omitted. The principle is to supply the pupil with a large number of exercises, to limit the vocabulary, and to introduce as few rules as possible. The method has much to commend it; but for purposes of mental discipline the elementary stages of learning may be made too easy. Royal roads are at best promenades, and lead nowhither.

A new contribution to Messrs. Macmillan's "Classical Series" is "Andocides De Mysteriis,"<sup>14</sup> edited by Mr. W. J. Hickie, formerly of Denstone School. In the Preface Mr. Hickie justifies the choice of this oration for a school-book to succeed the *Delectus*, on the ground that it is easier than Xenophon's, and that the style is purer. We doubt if boys will find it easier than the easy parts of Xenophon, or if they will like it as well; but an excursion into "fresh woods" is always desirable. A Life of Andocides is given, and there are ample notes,

<sup>11</sup> "The Seven against Thebes of Æschylus." With an Introduction and Notes by Isaac Flagg, Professor in the Cornell University. Boston: Ginn & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1885.

<sup>12</sup> Σοφοκλείους Αντιγόνη μετα κριτικῶν υπομνημάτων. Ἐν Ἀθῆναις τυποῖς Ἀττικῶν Μουσείων. 1885.

<sup>13</sup> "Macmillan's Latin Course. First Year." By A. M. Cook, M.A. London: Macmillan & Co. 1885.

<sup>14</sup> "Andocides De Mysteriis." Edited, with Critical Notes, by W. J. Hickie, M.A. London: Macmillan & Co. 1885.

which will be of use to schoolmasters. The type is small and unattractive.

From Messrs. Macmillan's "Illustrated Primary Series of French and German Readings" we have a selection from La Fontaine's Fables,<sup>1</sup> with Introduction and notes by Mr. Louis M. Moriarty. The fables are well chosen, and the Introduction and notes (like all work from Mr. Moriarty which has come under our notice) well done and to the point.

From Messrs. Blackwood's "Educational Series" we have to acknowledge "The Sixth Standard Reader,"<sup>16</sup> a collection of pieces both in verse and prose from the best English authors. Each piece is headed with a few explanatory words giving in briefest outline the life of the author. The selections are most skilfully and judiciously made.

The new volume of the "Elementary Classics" is "Cicero De Amicitia,"<sup>17</sup> with Introduction, notes, and vocabulary by E. S. Shuckburgh, M.A.

We have received from Putnam's Sons two charming little volumes of handy size and very tastefully bound. One is "A New England Conscience," by Belle C. Greene; the other, "The Knight of the Black Forest," by Grace Denio Litchfield.<sup>18</sup> Both are agreeable books, with all the usual characteristics which distinguish American novels. From the time when Mrs. Beecher Stowe took the world by surprise with "Uncle Tom's Cabin" most readers of fiction have gladly welcomed any writings by Transatlantic authors. The reason is not far to seek. Most of them are more or less original and striking. The epithet most applicable to them is that they are *strong*. They are rarely namby-pamby, rarely dull. Whatever the characters that they depict may be, the analysis is generally deep and true, and they know how to cast a subtle charm over the roughest material. "A New England Conscience" is evidently a true picture of the different effects of new doctrines, or interpretations of old ones, on the fervid and excitable natures of the New England folk. Miss Greene has manipulated her characters with great skill; at once abhorrent and pathetic, they are invariably natural, so that the reader's sympathy never flags. "The Knight of the Black Forest" is in direct contrast, but quite as readable, and perhaps more pleasant, than its fellow. We hope to see more of these elegant little books from Messrs. Putnam.

Were it not that the title of Mr. Monroe Royce's book proclaims him to be an American we should not have suspected it, for "Two

<sup>1</sup> "Fables de la Fontaine." A Selection, with Introduction, Notes, and Vocabulary, by Louis M. Moriarty. "Macmillan's Primary Series." London: Macmillan & Co. 1885.

<sup>16</sup> "The Sixth Standard Reader." "Blackwood's Educational Series." London and Edinburgh: Blackwood. 1885.

<sup>17</sup> "Laelius: a Dialogue on Friendship, by M. Tullius Cicero." By E. S. Shuckburgh, M.A. London: Macmillan & Co. 1885.

<sup>18</sup> "A New England Conscience." By Belle C. Greene. "The Knight of the Black Forest." By Grace Denio Litchfield. London and New York: Putnam's Sons.

Englishmen: by an American"<sup>19</sup> lacks the true ring or twang of American novels, to say nothing of the varied interest and originality which usually characterize them. Mr. Royce sets out by declaring in his Preface that he has "no opinions." We are therefore somewhat surprised, and not a little disgusted, at his strictures on Lord Beaconsfield. They are beneath contempt, and there is little or nothing in the novel itself to redeem them.

In "Love the Reward"<sup>20</sup> Mr. Philip May poses as the exponent and apologist of Nihilism. Our concern is not with politics but with "Belles Lettres;" still we must say *en passant* that we do not like his programme, nor does it gain anything from the literary ability of Mr. May's treatment; his style is laboriously flippant and sarcastic, and his book is wearisome reading.

"Morning Grey"<sup>21</sup> is a pleasant book; but it would be pleasanter still if half the second volume and the whole of the third were cut away. The *moment psychologique* is reached when the heroine refuses her lover for no other reason, apparently, than that he makes his offer in the middle of the second volume instead of waiting till the end of the third.

"The Sacred Nugget"<sup>22</sup> is a capital novel. No doubt it is open to criticism, as are all Mr. Farjeon's books, and its faults may be best summed up by saying that the execution wants fineness and subtlety. It is a sort of scene-painting in fiction. The lights are too high, and the shadows too deep. As a picture it is effective but gaudy. Nevertheless, it has the one indispensable quality in a novel: it charms and enthral the reader. The sting of criticism is drawn when the critic is interested and delighted.

"Self-doomed,"<sup>23</sup> is hardly up to Mr. Farjeon's best form. It has the air of a translation from the German, or of an imitation of Breckmann-Chatrian's "Contes du Rhin." Still it is not without a certain amount of interest.

"The Old Corner House,"<sup>24</sup> by L. H., does not call for much comment; it is as little calculated to evoke hostile criticism as enthusiastic praise. It may fairly be classed as a somewhat neutral-tinted story, in no way beyond the average. There are two heroines, sisters, who are in everything a direct contrast to each other, and on this contrast the whole story may be said to turn. It does not derive any special charm from style or mode of narration; but it is quite a readable book.

<sup>19</sup> "Two Englishmen." By An American. In 1 vol. London: Griffith, Farran & Co. 1885.

<sup>20</sup> "Love the Reward: a Novel." By Philip May. In 3 vols. London: Remington & Co. 1885.

<sup>21</sup> "Morning Grey: a Novel." By G. M. In 3 vols. London: Ward & Downey. 1885.

<sup>22</sup> "The Sacred Nugget." By B. L. Farjeon. In 3 vols. London: Ward & Downey. 1885.

<sup>23</sup> "Self-doomed." By B. L. Farjeon. London: Griffith, Farran & Co. 1885.

<sup>24</sup> "The Old Corner House." By L. H. In 2 vols. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1885.

Mr. Lucas Malet's three-volume novel, "Colonel Enderby's Wife,"<sup>25</sup> cannot be so lightly dismissed. It is poignant, grievously pathetic, a fateful, disheartening book, but it is unquestionably clever, and when a work of art is clever, it is idle to quarrel with the artist because it is what he has made it, and not something else more agreeable to the individual taste of the reader. For our own part, our taste inclines towards art that does not seek to reproduce real life, with its bitter cruelties, its inexorable hardness, but rather to waft us out of real life into a golden age, to make us "lie down in green pastures" and to lead us "beside the still waters." But how many invaluable works of fiction would this limitation exclude! Nearly all George Eliot's masterpieces, and all the finest works of Alphonse Daudet. Everything in "Colonel Enderby's Wife" is clever—the talk, the author's pessimistic reflections, the arrangement of incident for the natural production of the inevitable tragic *dénouement*, and above all the delineation of character; those of Colonel Enderby and of his wife are *chef-d'œuvres* both in themselves, and in their cruel contrast and unfitness to each other.

With an unusual play of fancy in the design, and considerable originality in the treatment, "The Waters of Hercules"<sup>26</sup> must be pronounced a most agreeable work of fiction. But its chief merit lies in the local colouring, which in itself, and quite apart from the story, charms the reader, and leads him pleasantly through the three volumes that might otherwise have seemed too long. The scene is laid in Lower Hungary, on the borders of Roumania, and the people, scenery, and superstitions of this wild region are vividly depicted. The whole story turns upon the Gaura Dracului, a fathomless abyss hidden in the heart of the densely wooded mountains, where, according to an ancient legend, a Roman soldier, of the time of Trojan, had slain his wife in a frenzy of jealousy. A young German Professor accidentally discovers the spot, and is so fascinated by it that he marks a tree close by with the intention of re-visiting it at some future time and thoroughly exploring the chasm. Twenty years later, crippled by an accident, he is ordered to the sulphur springs of Hercules, situated in the adjacent valley of the Djernis, when the chance finding of an old MS. in his desk recalls to the Professor his youthful enthusiasm for Gaura Dracului, and at the same time fires his daughter—the heroine of the tale—with the determination to discover it. She encounters almost insurmountable difficulties, arising partly from the arduous and perilous nature of the ground, but still more from the superstitious secrecy of the natives. We will not spoil the story by following the search in detail; suffice it to say that the *dénouement* is artistically brought about, and some highly dramatic incidents introduced, such as the Roumanian brigands, and, above all, the conflagration in the forest.

<sup>25</sup> "Colonel Enderby's Wife: a Novel." By Lucas Malet. In 3 vols. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co.

<sup>26</sup> "The Waters of Hercules." By E. D. Gerard. In 3 vols. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood & Sons. 1885.

"The Forked Tongue"<sup>27</sup> is unlike the usual run of modern English novels. But to be unlike is not necessarily to be superior. To speak plainly, "The Forked Tongue" is in all respects below the ordinary standard of English fiction. In its tone, and in the class of adventures it affects to chronicle, it more nearly resembles a French than an English story. But here the likeness ceases, for most French novels, whatever may be thought of their morality, have at least the merit of being written in correct French, and many are models of literary excellence. But Mr. De Haviland, while quoting impartially from Latin, Greek, French, German, and Italian authors, writes the most sorry English we have recently had occasion to wade through. He has certain pet phrases which he reiterates *ad nauseam*. Thus the word "right," used adverbially, occurs at a moderate computation fifty times in the first two hundred pages. "Certes" is another favourite word. In the midst of slip-slop and familiar talk, one comes on such stilted expressions as "What mean you?" "What think you?" till one expects the heroines (their name is legion) to exclaim, "Unhand me, villain!" and Heaven knows they have often enough occasion for such an exclamation! As for the story, it is best described as *décousu*. It is a series of adventures strung together like beads, the only connecting thread being that the same hero figures in all of them, and for the most part equally discreditably. The tale is, we presume, designed to exemplify the ruin which may be wrought by slanderous tongues, but its more obvious moral is that crime and disaster are the inevitable consequences of unbridled self-indulgence.

In "Camilla's Girlhood,"<sup>28</sup> by Linda Villari, we have a curious admixture of the commonplace and the sensational. The characters seem to be the very last people to whom any romantic adventures should come, and yet, with one whirl of Fortune's wheel, we behold them mixed up with spies and assassins. At one moment we are thrilled by old memories of Garibaldi and Mazzini, and at another carried off to give our sympathies to the Danes in the Schleswig-Holstein War. Nevertheless, the book is well written, and the impressions of scenery and travel are vivid and interesting. The grave fault of the story is the exaggerated credulity of Camilla, who is hoodwinked to a degree that could never happen in real life.

Miss Jeanie Gwynne Bettany's "House of Rimmon"<sup>29</sup> is not dull, nor, on the whole, badly written. But her personages bear but a faint resemblance to ordinary creatures of flesh and blood. We are willing to make every allowance for our ignorance of life in "the Black Country," but even there we cannot help doubting that people comport themselves as described by Miss Bettany. Still more do we doubt whether events in that, to us, unfamiliar region shape

<sup>27</sup> "The Forked Tongue." By Robert Langstaff De Haviland, M.A. In 1 vol. London: Vizetelly & Co. 1885.

<sup>28</sup> "Camilla's Girlhood." By Linda Villari. In 2 vols. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1885.

<sup>29</sup> "The House of Rimmon: a Black-Country Story." By Jeanie Gwynne Bettany. In 3 vols. London: Remington & Co.

themselves so conveniently for fictional needs as they are shaped in "The House of Rimmon." It is hard to believe that one family should contain three such unmitigated scoundrels as Mr. Joshua Rimmon, his son, and his nephew. But it is quite beyond belief that, even in the most undermined district, three buildings, by no means contiguous, should at the same opportune moment fall in for the express purpose of engulfing two of the leading villains—there are three more in the book—and producing an effective *dénouement*.

"Steyneville; or, Fated Fortunes: being the Memoirs of an Unextraordinary Man,"<sup>30</sup> is prefaced by an "Apologue" wherein the author, Miss Hélène Gingold, bemoans herself that her "cockleshell of a boat" is to be exposed to "the cold wind of censurè," "the heavy breakers of ridicule," and "the hidden rocks of Cape Critical." But has she no pity to bestow on her unhappy critic? To read and criticize such literature as "Steyneville" is a task deserving of some commiseration. There is absolutely nothing to be said in favour of the book. It is tedious, high-flown, and full of errors which seem to be caused by ignorance of the most elementary rules of English composition, and, indeed, of the use and meaning of ordinary English words. Thus we are told that the Steynevilles were "cosmopolitical," instead of cosmopolitan. A society meant to be described as "anti-conventional" is invariably spoken of as "ante-conventional." It is useless to multiply instances. But "Eureka! how hot it is!" is a *malaprop* far too good to be passed unnoticed. It occurs twice in the first volume.

Signor Barrili's new novel, "A Noble Kinsman,"<sup>31</sup> is fully equal to a former work of his, "The Devil's Portrait," of which we spoke so highly in a recent number of THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW. "A Noble Kinsman" does not strike us as being so well translated, but it is a charming story, peopled with interesting and well-sustained characters. Such works as Signor Barrili's are valuable contributions to contemporary Belles Lettres in Italy.

Mr. John Ormsby's new translation of "Don Quixote"<sup>32</sup> is a thing worth doing well done. "Except the Bible, no book," says Mr. Ormsby, "has been so widely diffused as 'Don Quixote.' The 'Imitatio Christi' may have been translated into as many different languages, and perhaps 'Robinson Crusoe' and the 'Vicar of Wakefield' into nearly as many, but in multiplicity of translations and editions 'Don Quixote' leaves them all behind." To England belongs the honour of having been first in the field, Shelton's translation, published in 1612, being the first in any language. To England, too, belongs the credit of having made the first effort towards correctness of text, in the London

<sup>30</sup> "Steyneville; or, Fated Fortunes: being the Memoirs of an Unextraordinary Man." By Hélène E. A. Gingold. In 3 vols. London: Remington & Co. 1885.

<sup>31</sup> "A Noble Kinsman: a Novel." By Anton Giulio Barrili. Translated from the Italian by H. A. Martin. In 2 vols. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1885.

<sup>32</sup> "The Ingenious Gentleman Don Quixote of La Mancha." By Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra. A Translation, with Introduction and Notes, by John Ormsby, translator of the "Poem of the Cid." In 4 vols. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1885.



edition of 1738. Yet up to the present time no really worthy and adequate English translation of the immortal novel of Cervantes has been executed. That known as "Jarvis's" is undoubtedly the best, but it is far from fulfilling the requirements of modern linguistic science, and still farther from reaching the high standard of literary excellence befitting the English version of a great classic. Thus Mr. Ormsby's is the first really scientific and literary English translation of "Don Quixote" which has been made. He brings to the undertaking an evidently profound knowledge of Spanish, more especially of the Spanish of Cervantes and his contemporaries, sensible and unexaggerated theories about Cervantes and his work, and lastly no small skill as an English prose writer. His Introduction is admirable, and his Life of Cervantes, while carefully sifting ascertained facts from time-honoured conjecture, reads like a romance. His English version is spirited and terse; at the same time it certainly gives the impression of being a close translation. But on this point we cannot speak from personal knowledge, for we have not compared the translation with the Spanish text, nor should we feel justified, on the strength of being able to read Spanish currently, in criticizing a performance which is evidently the outcome of a prolonged study of Spanish literature of the sixteenth century.

The English version of "L'Assommoir"<sup>33</sup> brought out by Messrs. Vizetelly has the merit of being unabridged and "unbowdlerized." It has the additional attraction of being illustrated from designs by several well-known French artists. The translation is fairly well done; but no more. It often errs on the side of literalness, especially where idioms are concerned. For instance, "se regarder dans le blanc des yeux," does not mean "to look at the white of each other's eyes," still less does "s'en cacher" mean "to hide oneself." Many words, too, are painstakingly translated which would have been more characteristic, and even more intelligible, left in the original French. Thus most people know what a *concierge* is, but this familiar and unpopular official becomes all but unrecognizable under the English disguise of "the doorkeeper." Altogether the "Assommoir" is considerably dimmed and obscured by its English dress; but still, how natural and life-like are the incidents and situations, and, above all, how human and living are the characters, when compared with the shadowy creations who occupy the scene in commonplace novels.

"The Upshot of 'Hamlet,'"<sup>34</sup> by Arthur Gigadibs, is a little pamphlet written under a fantastic pseudonym borrowed from a chance word in Browning's "Bishop Blougram's Apology." It contains much sound and rational criticism. At p. 18 we read: "The thesis here undertaken is that, the Germans notwithstanding, it was at least not the invariable practice of Shakspeare to plan a drama with the idea of

<sup>33</sup> "The 'Assommoir' (the Prelude to 'Nana'): a Realistic Novel." By Emile Zola. Translated, without Abridgment, from the Ninety-seventh French Edition. Illustrated with sixteen page Engravings. London: Vizetelly & Co. 1884.

<sup>34</sup> "The Upshot of 'Hamlet.'" By Arthur Gigadibs. London: Freethought Publishing Company. 1885.

applying a definite principle, or conveying a subtle lesson ; that, on the contrary, he in many cases assuredly set about re-writing old stories or plays with no other purpose, in the strict sense of the term, than that of furnishing his company, as he could so well do, with a more vigorously written set of parts than was supplied by the plays before him ; and that 'Hamlet' was demonstrably in this spirit, whether we regard it as mainly based on the previous 'Hamlet' or merely on the 'Hystorie.' With this opinion we entirely concur. We do not so completely sympathize with "Gigadibs" when he seeks to establish that various passages in "Hamlet," notably the soliloquy "To be, or not to be," &c., are echoes from Montaigne. They may or may not have been suggested by a perusal of Florio's translation. But we confess the question does not interest us. If Montaigne's phrase, "Fortune has more judgment than we," is really the germ of

"There's a divinity that shapes our ends  
Rough-hew them how we will,"

it is so transfigured as to be unrecognizable. But we must do Mr. "Arthur Gigadibs" the justice to acknowledge that it is not to detract from the glory of Shakspeare that he points out the sources from whence he may be supposed to have borrowed. He freely admits that all men have borrowed, and must borrow. *Ex nihilo, nihil fit.* Nevertheless, it is doing scant justice to Shakspeare to pronounce him "the greatest of all stylists," with the explanation that "the function of the stylist is not so much to evolve new propositions as to clothe valuable thoughts in the very best language" (p. 21). That Shakspeare was something of a pessimist we are not prepared to dispute. Perhaps all deep and clear-headed thinkers are more or less tinged with pessimism. But we cannot admit that it was his characteristic or prevailing mood. However, with some minor divergences of opinion, we are of one mind with "Gigadibs" as regards his main contention—viz., "that the only way to get a sound common ground is to regard Shakspeare, not as a great systematic thinker and artist of superhuman consistency and altitude of view, but as a marvellously gifted poet with certain marked idiosyncrasies, who worked on more or less thoroughly known dramatic materials, with the object of making a good living as a member of a theatrical company" (p. 30). If his personages were made to speak as never man spake, pouring forth with careless prodigality words that might seem inspired, we are inclined to think, with Archbishop Whately, that "it was because he could not help it."

The "Thirteenth Address of the President to the Philological Society,"<sup>35</sup> besides matter of purely technical interest, contains much that is both interesting and instructive to every intelligent and educated reader. This is especially true of the learned President's report on the Society's Dictionary. His exposition of the almost overwhelming difficulties which beset every step of his gigantic undertaking suffi-

---

<sup>35</sup> "Thirteenth Address of the President to the Philological Society." Delivered at the Anniversary Meeting, Friday, 16th May, 1884. By J. A. H. Murray, B.A., LL.D. London: Trübner & Co.

ciently accounts for the slowness with which the successive parts appear.

Sometimes [he says] the quest seems hopeless; recently, for example, the word *art* baffled me for several days; something *had* to be done with it; something was done, and put in type; but the renewed consideration of it in print, with the greater facility of reading and comparison which this afforded, led to the entire pulling to pieces and reconstruction of the edifice, extending over several columns of type. Such is the nature of the task; those who think that such work can be hurried, or that anything can accelerate it, except more brain power brought to bear on it, had better try.

As regards the time when the work may be expected to reach completion, Dr. Murray calculates that if, besides his present able coadjutors, Mr. Alfred Erlebach and Mr. John Mitchell, he had four more of equal ability, and if he himself could devote the whole of his time to the undertaking, it might be possible to finish the whole in eleven years!

We have received Vol. IV., Part II., of Messrs. Cassell's excellent and well-arranged "Encyclopædic Dictionary,"<sup>36</sup> which, as a practical book of reference, deserves the highest praise. The explanations, though concise, are never perfunctory, and every shade of meaning is separately noticed.

Also Vol. III. (O to TIS) of "A Dictionary of Anonymous and Pseudonymous Literature of Great Britain,"<sup>37</sup> by the late Samuel Halkett and the late Rev. John Laing, M.A., a very useful work, the former volumes of which have been already noticed in THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW.

<sup>36</sup> "The Encyclopædic Dictionary." Vol. IV. Part II. London, Paris, New York, and Melbourne: Cassell & Co (Limited). 1885.

<sup>37</sup> "A Dictionary of the Anonymous and Pseudonymous Literature of Great Britain." By the late Samuel Halkett and the late Rev. John Laing. Edinburgh. William Paterson. 1885.

# INDEX.

*All Books must be looked for under the Author's name.*

- ABBOTT, Captain James, "Narrative of a Journey from Herat to Khiva, Moscow, and St. Petersburg, during the late Russian Invasion of Khiva." Two vols. Third edition, 550
- "Agnostic's, The, Progress from the Known to the Unknown," 219
- Akeroyd, *see* Bosboom
- Alchemist, "The Altruistic Act; an Essay in Ethics," 223
- Argyll, The Duke of, "Geology and the Deluge," 560
- Arnold, Matthew, "God and the Bible," popular edition, 209
- Asher, Dr. D., "Das Endergebniss der Schopenhauer'schen Philosophie in seiner Uebereinstimmung mit einer der ältesten Religionen dargestellt," 539
- Ashton, John, "English Caricature and Satire on Napoleon I.," 296
- Asseline, Alfred, "Victor Hugo intime," 597
- BAMPTON, C., Edited by, "Frank Leward" Memorials, 273
- Barber, T. W., "Scientific Theology," 537
- Baring-Gould, S., M.A., "The Origin and Development of Religious Belief; I. Polytheism and Monotheism; II. Christianity," 519
- Barlow, George, "Poems, Real and Ideal," 286
- Barneby, W. H., "Life and Labour in the Far Far West," 235
- Basil, "The Wearing of the Green," 591
- Bastian, A., "Religions-philosophische Probleme auf dem Forschungsfelde Buddhistischer Psychologie und der vergleichenden Mythologie," 538
- BAUER, KAROLINE, LEOPOLD I., AND BARON STOCKMAR, 460-488
- Beet, J. A., "A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians," 528
- Bell, H. T. M., "A Forgotten Genius: Charles Whitehead," 267
- Bellamy, E., "Miss Ludington's Sister," 292
- Bersier, E., D.D., "Coligny: the Earlier Life of the Great Huguenot," translated by A. H. Holmden, 275
- Betham-Edwards, Miss, "Poems," 583
- "Biblia, A Smaller, Pauperum, conteynyng thyrtie and eighte wodecuttes, &c." 217
- Blackburne, Gertrude M. I., "Algernon Sidney: a Review," 570
- Blackie, J. S., F.R.S.E., "The Scottish Highlanders and the Land Laws," 545
- Blake, H. G. O., Edited by, "Summer," from the Journal of H. D. Thoreau, 293
- Blanford, H. F., F.R.S., "Report on the Meteorology of India in 1882," 565
- Blind, Mathilda, "Tarantella; a Romance," 590
- Bloomfield, Lady, Edited by, "Memoirs of Benjamin, Lord Bloomfield, G.C.B." 255
- Blunt, Henry, "Queen Amethyst; or, the Lips of Snow," 299
- Bosboom-Toussaint, A. L. G., "Major Frank;" translated from the Dutch by J. Akeroyd, 595
- Boulger, D. C., Edited by, "General Gordon's Letters from the Crimea, the Danube and Armenia, August, 1854, to November, 1858," 270
- Bourdeau, Louis, "Les Forces de l'Industrie," 231
- "Boy's, The, Own Book," 300
- Bray, Charles, "Phases of Opinion and Experience during a Long Life," 579
- Briton, E. Vincent, "Some Account of Amyot Brough," 593
- Britton, J. J., "A Sheaf of Ballads," 286
- Brown, J. C., LL.D., "Forestry in the Mining Districts of the Ural Mountains in Eastern Russia," 244
- Browning, R., "Ferishtah's Fancies," 283
- Bruno, Camille, "En Désordre," 598
- Bryant, Mrs. S., D.Sc., "Overwork: from the Teacher's Point of View." 554
- Buchanan, R., "Foxglove Manor," 291
- Bullen, A. H., Edited by, "The Works of Christopher Marlowe," 586
- "Carols and

- Poems, from the Fifteenth Century to the present Time," 587
- Burton, Richard P., Englished by, "Camœns, The Lyrics," 288
- Butterworth, H., "Zigzag Journeys in the Western States of America," 300
- Cable, G. W., "Dr. Sévier," 293  
 ——"The Creoles of Louisiana," 572
- Canterbury, Archbishop of, "The Seabury Commemoration:" a Sermon, 529
- Cashel-Hoe, Mrs., "The Lover's Creed," 589
- Chatterjee, B. C., "The Poison Tree," translated by M. S. Knight," 294
- Churton, Rev. W. R., B. D., "The Uncanonical and Apocryphal Scriptures," 213
- Clark, Cecil, "When all was Young," 590
- Cochin China, *see* France
- Colborne, Colonel, "With Hicks Pasha in the Sudan," 240
- Cole, G. F. Fitzroy, "The Peruvians at Home," 239
- "Cole, K. C. B., Fifty Years of Public Work of Sir Henry," 263
- Colenso, F. E., "The Ruin of Zululand," 258
- Collingwood, Harry, "Under the Meteor Flag," 300
- Conway, Moncure D., "Farewell Discourses," 213
- Coupland, J. A., "The Valley of Idleness and other Poems," 287
- Cowell, Herbert, "Tagore Law Lectures:" second edition, revised, 229
- Cox, S., D. D., "Balaam: an Exposition and a Study," 527
- Sir George, Bart, M. A., "Lives of Greek Statesmen," 567
- CROKER, JOHN WILSON, 150-188
- Cumming, C. F. Gordon, "In the Himalayas and on the Indian Plains," 240
- Cunningham, W., B. D., "Politics and Economics," 542
- CURRENCY, PROPOSED ALTERATION OF THE, 188-206
- Dale, R. W., LL. D., "Laws of Christ for Common Life," 528
- D'Anvers, N., "Heroes of American Discovery," 275
- Davitt, Michael, "Leaves from a Prison Diary," 549
- De Candolle, A., "Origin of Cultivated Plants," 243
- De Musset, A., "On ne badine pas avec l'amour" and "Fantasio," Edited by W. H. Pollock, 301
- Deverell, F. H., "All Round Spain, by Road and Rail," 239
- Dixie, Lady Florence, "Waifs and Strays," 287
- Dobell, Mrs. H., "In the Watches of the Night," vol. iv., 288  
 ——"vol. v., 586
- Dobson, Austin, "Thomas Bewick and his Pupils," 281
- Dowell, Stephen, "History of Taxation and Taxes in England, from the Earliest Times to the Present Day," 230
- Drinkwater, A. E., "Plays and Poems," 585
- "ENCYCLOPÆDIC Dictionary, The," vol. iv., part 1, "Glot Int," 589
- English, C. Davis, "The Philosophy of a Future State," 537
- "English Illustrated Magazine, The," 1883-4, 300
- "English Sacred Lyrics," 289
- Enis, "Gathered Leaves," 584
- Ewald, Prof. H., "The History of Israel," vol. vii., 530
- Eyre, G., "The Lady of Ranza, and other Poems," 287
- FAITHFUL, Emily, "Three Visits to America," 235
- Farjeon, B. L., "Great Porter Square," 595
- Faulds, Henry, "Nine Years in Nipon," 552
- Featherman, A., "Social History of the Races of Mankind. First Division Nigritians," 548
- Fels, Jacob, "Shakespeare and Montaigne," 297
- Ferguson, R. M., M. A., "Rambles in the Far North," second edition, 241
- Field, Michael, "Callirhoe," and "Fair Rosamond," 586
- Fleet, F. R., "An Analysis of Wit and Humour," 596
- Forbes, U. A., "Otterstone Hall," 295
- Forsyth, Evelyn, edited by, "Ye Gestes of ye Ladye Anne," illustrated by A. H. Broadwood, 298
- Fowler, T., M. A., "Progressive Morality: an Essay in Ethics," 223
- FRANCE AND COCHIN-CHINA, 127-150
- Franko, A. H., "Das Alte Testament bei Johannes," 526
- Fraser, A. C., D. C. L., "Selections from Berkeley. With an Introduction and Notes," 225
- Freeman, E. A., "The Office of the Historical Professor," 230  
 ——"Disestablishment and

- Disendowment: What are They? " second edition, 517
- Fremantle, Hon. and Rev. W. H., "The World as the Subject of Redemption," Bampton Lectures, 1883, 520
- Friedmann, Paul, "Anne Boleyn: a Chapter of English History," 253
- Frønde, J. A., "Thomas Carlyle: a History of his Life in London, 1834-81," 260
- Fuller, Rev. Morris, "The Life, Times, and Writings of Thomas Fuller, D.D.," 274
- Furneaux, H., M.A., edited by, with Notes for the Use of Schools, "Cornelii Taciti Annalium, Libri i.-iv.," 588
- GARDEN, MR., edited by, "Memorials of James Hogg, the Ettrick Shepherd," 575
- Gariatt, Alfred C., M.D., "Myths in Medicine, and Old Time Doctors," 279
- George, Ernest, "Etchings of Old London," 597
- Gibbon, Charles, "By Mead and Stream," 591
- Gilbert, H. W., "Aldornere, and two other Pennsylvanian Idylls," 584
- Gill, C., "The Evolution of Christianity," 219
- Goldsmith, Oliver, "The Vicar of Wakefield," adapted for use in schools, 301
- Gomme, G. L., F.S.A., edited by, "The Gentleman's Magazine Library," Popular Superstitions, 241
- Gorringer, H. H., Lieut.-Commander, U.S.N., "Egyptian Obelisks," 553
- Gosse, Edmund, edited and annotated by, "The Discourses of Sir Joshua Reynolds," 297
- Gould, *see* Baring-
- Gross, Dr. Gustav, "Karl Marx," 269
- Guyau, M., "Esquisse d'une Morale sans obligations ni sanction," 224
- Guyot, Yves, "Un Drôle," 598
- HADLEY, James, "A Greek Grammar," 290
- Hall, Hubert, "A History of the Customs'-Revenue in England," 569
- G. Stanley, edited by, "Pedagogical Library," vol. i., 573
- Hamerton, P. G., "Human Intercourse," 302
- Hamilton, W. A. B., "Mr. Montenegro: a Romance of the Civil Service," 590
- Hare, A. J. C., "Sketches in Holland and Scandinavia," 554
- Hay, James, "Johnson: His Characteristics and Aphorisms," 274
- Hays, Frances, "Women of the Day," 570
- Heath, F. G., "The Fern Portfolio," 564
- R., "The English Via Dolorosa, or, Glimpses of the History of the Agricultural Labourer," 241
- "Helps to the Study of the Bible," 524
- Hennell, Sara S., "Comparative Ethics, II. Moral Principle in regard to Brotherhood," 539
- Herbert, Auberon, "A Politician in Trouble about his Soul," 228
- Herbert of Lea, Lord and Lady, "The Land Question: its Examination and Solution, from an Agricultural Point of View," analyzed by T. J. Elliot, Professor of Estate Management, 230
- Hermes, Paul, "The Confessions of Hermes, and other Poems," 287
- Herrick, S. E., D.D., "Some Heretics of Yesterday," 275
- Robert, "Herrick's Content: his Grange and his Book of Little Verses," illustrated by Ellen Houghton, 299
- Hodder, Edwin, "Simon Peter: his Life, Times and Friends," 219
- James M., D.Sc., B.D., "Philosophy and Faith: a Plea for Agnostic Belief," 536
- Hodgson, W., "Sketches Personal and Pensive," 302
- Holden, H. A., M.A., "The Economics of Xenophon," 290
- Holst, Dr. H. v., "Verfassungsgeschichte der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika seit der Administration Jackson's," 260
- Hood, E. P., "The World of Proverb and Parable," 597
- Hunt, J., D.D., "Pantheism and Christianity," 217
- Hutton, James, edited by, "Selections from the Letters and Correspondence of Sir James Bland Burges, Bart.," 577
- "INTERNATIONAL Policy: Essays on the Foreign Relations of England," second edition, 226
- JAMES, Charles, "Poems and Fragments," 286
- W., edited, with an Introduction, by, "The Literary Remains of the late Henry James," 589
- Jamieson, Rev. Geo., B.D., "Profound Problems in Theology and Philosophy," 219
- Jay, John, "The Peace Negotiations of 1782 and 1783," 573

- "John Herring: a West of England Romance," 295
- Johnston, T. Ruddiman, F.R.G.S., "The Reference Atlas of Political Geography," 247
- Jones, Ben. C., "Fact and Fiction," 302
- JUDICIAL (THE) SEPARATION OF MOTHER AND CHILD, 430-460
- KAUTZCH, E., "Hagenbach, K. R., Encyklopädie u. Methodologie der Theologischen Wissenschaften," 523
- "Keats, The Poetical Works of John," reprinted from the original editions, with Notes, by Francis T. Palgrave, 587
- Kellogg, J. A., "Philosophy of Henry James," 223
- Kelsey, F. W., M.A., "T. Lucreti Cari de Rerum Natura, Libri Sex," 588
- Kerry-Nicholls, J. H., "The King Country; or, Explorations in New Zealand," 551
- Kielland, A. L., "Garman and Worse," 595
- Kingzett, C. T., "Nature's Hygiene: a Systematic Manual of Natural Hygiene," second edition, 562
- Knight, W. F., B.C.L., "Teresa Marlow, Actress and Danter," 294
- Knox, A., "Differential Calculus for Beginners," 563
- LANE-POOLE, *see* Swift
- Lang, Andrew, M.A., "Custom and Myth," 278
- "Rhymes à la Mode," 582
- Langford, J. A., LL.D., "Child Life, as learned from Children," 585
- Lathrop, G. P., "An Echo of Passion," 292
- La Touche, Rev. J. D., "A Handbook of the Geology of Shropshire," 564
- Lawrence, T. J., M.A., "Essays on some Disputed Questions in Modern International Law," 227
- Lea, H. C., "An Historical Sketch of Sacerdotal Celibacy in the Christian Church," second edition, enlarged, 530
- Lee, J. H. Warburton, M.A., edited by, "T. Lucreti Cari 'De Rerum Natura,' Libri i.-ii., 290
- Lee, *see* Vernon
- Lee-Hamilton, Eugene, "Apollo and Marsyas, and other Poems," 588
- Lees, Hope, "Allan Stuart: a Novel," 594
- Leland, C. G., "The Algonquin Legends of New England," 302
- Little, Rev. H. W., "Madagascar: its History and People," 552
- Lorne, Marquis of, "Canadian Pictures, drawn with Pen and Pencil," 238
- Lotze, Hermann, "Outlines of Metaphysics," translated and edited by Prof. G. T. Ladd, 221
- "Outlines of the Philosophy of Religion," translated and edited by Prof. G. T. Ladd, 539
- Lovell, M. S., "The Edible Mollusca of Great Britain and Ireland," 561
- MACAULAY, JAMES, M.A., D.D., "True Tales of Travel and Adventure," 298
- Maccall, W., "Moods and Memoirs," 585
- Macdonald, George, "The Tragedies of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark," A Study, with the Text of the Folio of 1623, 587
- Mackail, J. W., M.A., "The Æneid of Virgil," translated into English, 586
- Maclaren, A., D.D., "A Year's Ministry," second series, 528
- Macleod, Rev. D., D.D., "The Sunday Home Service," 530
- Magee, W. C., D.D., "The Gospel and the Age," 219
- Major, G. M., "The Peril of the Republic, and other Poems," 585
- Malleison, Colonel, "The Battlefields of Germany," 257
- MALMESBURY'S (LORD), "MEMOIRS OF AN EX-MINISTER," 328-366
- "Mark Rutherford's Deliverance." Being the Second Part of his Autobiography. Edited by his friend, Reuben Shapcott, 597
- Marshall, Emma, "In the East Country with Sir Thomas Browne," 595
- Martineau, James, D.D., LL.D., "Types of Ethical Theory," 530
- Masson, J., M.A., "The Atomic Theory of Lucretius contrasted with Modern Doctrines of Atoms and Evolution," 219
- Max Müller, F., "Biographical Essays," 269
- edited by, "Anecdota Oxoniensia," vol. i. part iii, 301
- McCarthy, Justin, M.P., "A History of the Four Georges," vol. i., 568
- McLaughlin, Louise, "Suggestions to China Painters," 299
- Mill, J. S., "A System of Logic;" people's edition, 225
- Milton, John, "Paradise Lost." With Notes and Preface by Matthias Mull, 290

- Minchin, J. I., "The Divine Comedy of Dante Alighieri." Translated verse for verse from the original into Terza Rima, 586
- Molinier, Auguste, "The Thoughts of Blaise Pascal." Translated from the French by C. Kegan Paul, 530
- Montague, F. C., "The Limits of Individual Liberty," 539
- Montgomery, H. R., "Literary Impositions," 302
- Morell, J. D., A.M., LL.D., "Manual of History of Philosophy," 225
- "An Introduction to Mental Philosophy on the Inductive Method," 225
- Morey, W. C., Ph.D., "Outlines of Roman Law," 548
- Morin, A. S., "Essais de Critique Religieuse," 218
- "Mozley, Rev. J. B., D.D., Letters of the late," edited by his sister, 271
- Mozley, Rev. T., M.A., "Reminiscences, chiefly of Towns, Villages, and Schools," 574
- Muir, M. M. Pattison, M.A., "A Treatise on the Principles of Chemistry," 246
- NICHOLSON, *see* Smith
- Noel, Roden, "Songs of the Heights and Depths," 583
- Nordau, Max, from the German of, "The Conventional Lies of our Civilization," 233
- Norris, W. E., "A Man of his Word, and other Stories," 596
- OLDHAM, H., "The Man from Texas: a Western Romance," 291
- Oliphant, Lawrence, edited by, "Symplemmata; or, Evolutionary Forces now Active in Man," 535
- OTTOMAN TURKS (THE) IN EUROPE, 303-328
- OVERPRESSURE IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS, 1-20
- PAGE, F. E., M.A., "Q. Horatii Flacci Carminum, Liber iii.," 588
- Palgrave, *see* Kents
- Parker, W. K., F.R.S., "On Mammalian Descent." The Hunterian Lectures for 1884, 550
- Parkman, Francis, "Montcalm and Wolfe," 571
- Payn, James, "Some Literary Recollections," 300
- "The Talk of the Town," 591
- PETRARCH, 395
- Phillips, J., LL.D., F.R.S., "Manual of Geology: Theoretical and Practical." Edited by R. Etheridge, F.R.S., and H. G. Seeley, F.R.S., part i., 249
- "Phœbe." A Novel, 291
- Pidgeon, D., F.G.S., "Old World Questions and New World Answers," 236
- Plumptre, E. H., D.D., "The Spirits in Prison, and other Studies on the Life after Death," 219
- Pollock, *see* de Musset
- Poole, R. Lane, M.A., "Illustrations of the History of Mediæval Thought in the Departments of Theology and Ecclesiastical Politics," 211
- "Post Office (The) London Directory for 1885," 555
- Power, Cecil, "Philistia," 593
- Price, Eleanor C., "Gerald," 592
- Prince, Elian, "Love's Moods," 584
- PRIVATE BILL LEGISLATION, 488-517
- Probyn, J. W., "Italy, from the Fall of Napoleon I., in 1815, to the Death of Victor Emanuel in 1878," 574
- "Pulpit (The) Commentary." — I. Chronicles. II. Jeremiah and Lamcations," 524
- "Rainfall Chart of India." Compiled for the Government of India by H. F. Blandford, F.R.S., 247
- Rathbone, W., M.P., "Questions of the Day.—XV. Protection and Communism," 238
- Rawlinson, Rev. G., M.A., "Egypt and Babylon from Scripture and Profane Sources," 524
- "Reasonable Faith (A): Short Essays for the Times." By Three "Friends," 523
- Reed, Sir E. J., F.R.S., "A Treatise on the Stability of Ships," 567
- Reichardt, Rev. F. H., B.A., "The Relation of the Jewish Christians to the Jews in the First and Second Centuries," 525
- Reid, James, the Text revised and explained by, "M. Tulli Ciceronis Academicæ," 588
- S. J., "A Sketch of the Life and Times of the Rev. Sydney Smith," 262
- Reinach, Théodore, "Histoire des Israélites, depuis l'époque de leur dispersion jusqu'à nos jours," 527
- "Relations (The) between Religion and Science," 218
- Reville, A., D.D., "Prolegomena of the History of Religions," translated by A. S. Squire, 517
- Reynolds, *see* Gosse
- Riess, Ludwig L., "Geschichte des Wahl-



- rechts zum englischen Parlament im Mittelalter," 255
- Robinson, E. A., and G. A. Wall, "The Disk : a Prophetic Reflection," 291
- Rolleston, G., M.D., F.R.S., "Scientific Papers and Addresses," arranged and edited by W. Turner, M.B., LL.D., F.R.S., with a Biographical Sketch by E. B. Tylor, D.C.L., F.R.S., 245
- "Round Table Series." No. IV. "Walt Whitman, Poet and Democrat," 292
- "Royal Historical Society, Transactions of the," 280
- "Royal Society of Canada, Proceedings and Transactions of, for the years 1882, 1883," 248
- RUSSIAN HISTORY, THE MATERIALS OF EARLY, 100-127
- Ruprecht, Dr. W., "Die Wohnungen der Arbeitenden Klassen in London," 241
- SAYCE, A. H., "The Ancient Empires of the East," 251
- Scannell, Edith, "Play," 299
- Schmid, Herman, "The Chancellor of the Tyrol," translated by Dorothea Roberts, 595
- Scotus Novanticus, "Ethica : or, the Ethics of Reason," 532
- Sée, Julien, "Journal d'un Habitant de Colmar (Juillet à Novembre, 1870)," 281
- Serbati, Antonio Rosmini, "Psychology," vol. i. 222
- 
- "The Origin of Ideas," vol. iii. translated from the fifth Italian edition, 222
- Seypel, C. M., "He—She—It. Egyptian Court Chronicle, B.C. 1302," 298
- Shand, A. J., "Letters from the West of Ireland, 1884," 553
- Shakespeare, William, "Much Ado About Nothing." Now first published in fully recovered metrical form by W. W. Lloyd, 298
- Shaw, A., Ph.D., "Icaria : a Chapter in the History of Communism," 232
- Shipley, Orby, M.A., "Annus Sanctus," selected and arranged, 289
- Shorthouse, J. H., "The Little Schoolmaster Mark," part ii., 591
- Shumway, Edgar S., "A Handbook of Latin Synonyms," 290
- Sidgwick, A., M.A., "Æschylus Chœphoroi," with Introduction and Notes, 588
- Skat, Rev. W. W., M.A., "An Etymological Dictionary of the English Language," 301
- 
- edited by, "The Tale of Gamelyn," with Notes, 588
- Sladen, D. B. W., "A Summer Christmas," 286
- Smiles, Samuel, LL.D., "Men of Invention and Industry," 277
- Smith, Adam, "An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations," with an Introductory Essay and Notes, by Joseph S. Nicholson, M.A., 544
- Smith, Philip, B.A., "The Student's Ecclesiastical History," part ii., 568
- Soltera, Maria, "A Lady's Ride across Spanish Honduras," 239
- Spence, Canon, "The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," 525
- Stanley, T. Lloyd, "An Outline of the Future Religion of the World," 216
- Stanton, T., M.A., edited by, "The Woman Question in Europe ; a Series of Original Essays," 233
- Stephens, C. A., "The Adventures of Six Young Men in the Wilds of Maine and Canada," 300
- Stirling, J. H., LL.D., "Of Philosophy in the Poets," 534
- St. John, Sir Spenser, "Hayti, or the Black Republic," 257
- Stockton, F. R., "The Lady or the Tiger, and other Stories," 293
- Stormonth, Rev. J., "A Dictionary of the English Language," part xii., 301
- Stoughton, J., D.D., "Religion in England, from 1800 to 1850 ; a History, with a Postscript on subsequent Events," 215
- Strathesk, J., "Bits from Blinkbonny," 592
- "Summer," from the Journal of H. D. Thoreau, edited by H. G. O. Blake, 293
- Swan, A. S., "Aldersyde ; a Border Story of Seventy Years Ago," and "Carlowrie," 592
- Sweet, H., M.A., "First Middle English Primer with Grammar and Glossary," 290
- "Swift (Jonathan), Selections from the Prose Writings of," with a Preface and Notes by Stanley Lane Poole, 596
- Swinborne, F. P., "Gustavus Adolphus : an Historical Poem," 585
- Symonds, J. A., "Vagabunduli Libellus," 284
- 
- "Wine, Woman, and Song," with an Essay, 285
- TALMUD, ON THE STUDY OF THE, 20-53
- "Taylor, life and Letters of Bayard," edited by Marie Hansen-Taylor and Horace E. Scudder, 264
- Taylor, George, "Antinous ; an His-

- torical Romance of the Roman Empire," 295
- Taylor, James M., "Elements of the Differential and Integral Calculus," 563
- TEMPLE (DR.) ON RELIGION AND SCIENCE, 366-386
- Tennyson, Alfred, Lord, "Becket," 581
- "Thirty Thousand Thoughts." Sections x. xi., 524
- Thistledown, "Dunbar, the King's Advocate," 287
- Thompson, D. G., "A System of Psychology," 221
- Topinard, Dr. Paul, "Éléments d'Anthropologie générale," 558
- Townsend, B. O'N., "Plantation Lays," 288
- Traill, H. D., "Coleridge," 282
- TROLLOPE (ANTHONY) ENGLISH CHARACTER AND MANNERS AS PORTRAYED BY, 53-100
- Trowbridge, J. T., "Farnell's Folly," 590
- Trumbull, General, "The American Lesson of the Free Trade Struggle in England," 545
- Turner, E. A., "Stories for Young Children," 589
- Twain, Mark, "The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn," 596
- VERNON LEE, "Miss Brown," 589
- Verrall, A. W., "Studies, Literary and Historical, in the Odes of Horace," 587
- Villari, Linda, "On Tuscan Hills and Venetian Waters," 241
- WADDINGTON, Samuel, "Sonnets and other Verse," 287
- Wall, *see* Robinson
- Ward, T. H., "Humphrey Sandwith: a Memoir, compiled from Autobiographical Notes," 266
- Ward, Wilfred, "The Wish to Believe," 529
- Webb, T. E., "The Veil of Isis: a Series of Essays on Idealism," 587
- Welch, W., M.A., "Cæsar's Invasion of Britain," 290
- West, Mrs. Frederic, "The Doom of Doolandour," 295
- Whitman, *see* Round Table Series
- Williams, Henry L., extracted and set by, "Queer Quotes and Odd Jokes from 'Frisco," 596
- Williamson, Isabella, "Old Highways in China," 240
- Wingfield, Hon. Lewis, "Notes on Civil Costume in England from the Conquest to the Regency," 299
- Wolf, Lucien, "Sir Moses Montefiore," 268
- WORK (THE) OF WOMEN AS POOR LAW GUARDIANS, THE, 386-395
- Woodward, the late E. H., "Men, Women, and Progress," 590
- Wurtz, A., "Elements of Modern Chemistry," second American edition," 563
- Wylie, J. H., "History of England under Henry IV.," 252
- YOUNG, Arthur, "Destiny; or, Man's Will-Means and Will-Knds," 222

END OF VOL. LXVII.



